

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex libris
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
University of Alberta Library

<https://archive.org/details/Orlick1972>

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and
recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
for acceptance, the thesis entitled A SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL
ANALYSIS OF EARLY SPORTS PARTICIPATION submitted by
Terrance D. Orlick in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy



TERRANCE D. ORLICK

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1972

ABSTRACT

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled A SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF EARLY SPORTS PARTICIPATION submitted by Terrance D. Orlick in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

ABSTRACT

The central purpose of this study was to explore the question of why some children elected to participate in organized, competitive sport and others did not. Carefully selected standardized tests, as well as certain specifically designed interview schedules were utilized in the study. The two major interview schedules were concerned with measuring the family sports environment and the child's sports environment. Both of these instruments proved to be valid, internally consistent, and to have an average scoring reliability of 0.93.

The sampling of subjects was limited to 32 eight- and nine-year old boys, 16 of whom were sports participants and 16 who were non-participants in sports. The groups were equated by age, sex, grade level, availability of programs and facilities, and socio-economic level.

Significant differences were found between participant and non-participant children with respect to: Family Sports Environment, Child's Sports Environment, Overprotective Home Environment, Personality Traits, Early Activity Patterns, Present Activity Patterns, Play Interests, Self Perception of Sports Ability, Child's Attitudes About Sports and Mother's Attitudes About Sports.

As reflected by this study, participation in sport appeared to be largely dependent upon environmental factors which directly affected both the expectancies the child had regarding participation, and the reinforcement contingencies

to which he was exposed. In order to move toward the goal of maximizing participation in sports, children should be exposed to positive sports environments. Adjustments are necessary in both personnel and programs in order to meet the needs of different types of children from different types of environments.

This study has resulted in an initial theory of early participation in sport as well as some practical implications for making positive alterations in the present system of children's sports.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My most sincere appreciation is extended to the children who were the subjects in this study, and their families, from whom I gained so much. I am greatly indebted to the principal of Brookside Elementary School, Mr. Jack Hobson and to the grade three and grade four teachers, Marge Carver, Mrs. Crump, Helen Harasym and Mrs. Markle, who made the task of gathering data a pleasant experience. It is my genuine intention to return to the system at least as much as I have taken out.

I would like to thank Dr. R.B. Alderman, for allowing me to pursue my own problem in my own way, and the other members of my supervisory committee, each of whom contributed in his own unique manner. I am particularly grateful to Dr. E.E. Fox for helping me to tackle a very difficult problem in a very meaningful way. Appreciation is also extended to Dr. J.H. Duthie for acting as external examiner for the final defense of this dissertation, and to Cathy for being beyond the call of duty.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I - STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	1
I. Introduction and Importance of the Study.	1
II. The Problem.....	3
III. Delimitations.....	6
IV. Definition of Terms.....	6
CHAPTER II - REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	9
I. Socialization and Behavioral Acquisition.	9
Socialization and the Family.....	9
Dependency Fostering Home	
Environment.....	12
Family Related Research.....	13
II. Expectancy.....	15
III. Personality.....	16
Personality Traits of Athletes.....	17
Personality - Participation	
Relationship.....	18
Personality Research with	
Athletic Children.....	19
IV. Self Concept.....	21
Self Concept and Participation.....	22
Self Concept - Participation	
Relationship.....	23
V. Level of Activity.....	24
CHAPTER III - INSTRUMENTS.....	28
I. Selection and Construction.....	28
II. General Interview Information.....	29
III. Children's Research Instruments.....	32
Child Sports Environment Interview	
(CSE).....	32

	Page
The Thomas Self Concept Values Test (TSC).....	34
Self Perception of Sports Ability....	35
Children's Attitudes about Sport Interview (AAS-C).....	36
The SRA Inventory of Children's Interests.....	38
The Children's Personality Questionnaire.....	40
IV. Parents' Research Instruments.....	41
Family Sports Environment Interview (FSE).....	41
Dependency Fostering-Overprotective Home Environment Interview (DFO).....	42
Early Activity Patterns (EAP).....	43
Present Activity Patterns (PAP).....	46
Attitudes about Sports (AAS-P).....	48
General Information Questionnaire - Parents (GIQ-P).....	49
CHAPTER IV - METHODS AND PROCEDURE.....	51
I. Selection of the Sample.....	51
II. Collection of the Data.....	55
III. Analysis of the Data.....	61
CHAPTER V - RESULTS.....	63
I. Results of Children's Instruments.....	63
Child Sports Environment Interview - Quantified Data.....	63
Child Sports Environment Interview - Percentage Data.....	71
Thomas Self Concept Values Test.....	83
Self Perception of Sports Ability....	85
Children's Attitude about Sports.....	85
SRA Children's Interest Inventory....	87
Children's Personality Questionnaire.....	89
II. Results of Parents' Instruments.....	91
Family Sports Environment Interview - Quantified Data.....	91

	Page
Family Sports Environment Inter- view - Percentage Data.....	101
Dependency Fostering-Overprotective Home Environments.....	106
Early Activity Patterns of Child.....	106
Present Activity Patterns of Child...	108
Mothers' Attitude about Sports.....	111
Fathers' Attitude about Sports.....	111
General Demographic Information.....	113
III. Validity and Reliability of Interview Schedules.....	115
IV. Interview Excerpts.....	117
Children's Excerpts.....	117
Mother Excerpts.....	121
CHAPTER VI - DISCUSSION.....	126
I. Discussion of Children's Responses.....	126
Child Sports Environment.....	126
Self Perception of Sports Ability....	128
Active and Quiet Interests.....	129
Personality Traits.....	130
II. Discussion of Parents' Responses.....	134
Family Sports Environment.....	134
Dependency Fostering-Overprotective Home Environment.....	136
Activity Patterns.....	137
III. Discussion of Children's Sports.....	139
Revisions Needed in Children's Sports.....	139
Promoting Mass Participation.....	142
IV. A Theory of Early Participation in Sports.....	144
CHAPTER VII - SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	149
I. Summary.....	149
II. Conclusions.....	150

	Page
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	154
APPENDIX A - CHILDREN'S RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS.....	170
APPENDIX B - PARENTS' RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS.....	191
APPENDIX C - INITIAL CONTACTS WITH SUBJECTS.....	208
APPENDIX D - PARAMETRIC VERSUS NON-PARAMETRIC STATISTICS.....	211
APPENDIX E - FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS.....	218
APPENDIX F - INTERVIEW EXCERPTS.....	226
APPENDIX G - REPORT SENT TO COMMUNITY.....	263

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Child Sports Environment (Part A): Means, Standard Deviations, Welch's T-Test and Two Sided Probability for Both Participant and Non-Participant Groups (5 Point Scale).....	64
2	Frequency Distribution (Part A) (Percent) for Questions Comprising Child Sports Environment Interview for Both Participant and Non-Participant Groups (5 Point Scale).....	65
3	Child Sports Environment (Part B): Means, Standard Deviations, Welch's T-Test and Two Sided Probability for Both Participant and Non-Participant Groups (5 Point Scale).....	66
4	Frequency Distribution (Part B) (Percent) for Questions Comprising Child Sports Environment Interview for Both Participant and Non-Participant Groups (5 Point Scale).....	67
5	Thomas Self Concept Values Test (Standard Scores): Means, Standard Deviations, Welch's T-Test, and Two Sided Probability for Both Participant and Non-Participant Groups.....	84
6	Self Perception of Sports Ability: Mean, Standard Deviation, Welch's T-Test and Two Sided Probability for Both Participant and Non-Participant Groups.....	85
7	Children's Attitude about Sport: Means, Standard Deviations, Welch's T-Test and Two Sided Probability for Both Participant and Non-Participant Groups.....	86
8	SRA Interest Inventory: Means, Standard Deviations, Welch's T-Test and Two Sided Probability for Both Participant and Non-Participant Groups.....	87

Table		Page
9	Children's Personality Questionnaire: Means, Standard Deviations, Welch's T-Test and Probability for Both Participant and Non-Participant Groups.....	90
10	Family Sports Environment (Part A): Means, Standard Deviations, Welch's T-Test and Two Sided Probability for Both Participant and Non-Participant Groups (5 Point Scale).....	92
11	Frequency Distribution (Part A) (Percent) for Questions Comprising Family Sports Environment Interview for Both Participant and Non-Partici- pant Groups (5 Point Scale).....	93
12	Family Sports Environment (Part B): Means, Standard Deviations, Welch's T-Test and Two Sided Probability for Both Participant and Non-Participant Groups (5 Point Scale).....	94
13	Frequency Distribution (Part B) (Percent) for Questions Comprising Family Sports Environment Interview for Both Participant and Non-Partici- pant Groups (5 Point Scale).....	95
14	Dependency Fostering-Overprotective Home Environment: Mean, Standard Deviation, Welch's T-Test and Two Sided Probability for Both Participant and Non-Participant Groups.....	106
15	Early Activity Patterns of Child: Mean, Standard Deviations, Welch's T-Test and Two Sided Probability for Both Participant and Non-Participant Groups (5 Point Scale).....	107
16	Present Activity Patterns of Child: Mean, Standard Deviations, Welch's T-Test and Two Sided Probability for Both Participant and Non-Participant Groups (5 Point Scale).....	110

Table		Page
17	Mother's Attitude about Sports: Means, Standard Deviations, Welch's T-Test and Two Sided Probability for Both Participant and Non-Participant Groups (7 Point Scale).....	112
18	Father's Attitude about Sports: Means, Standard Deviations, Welch's T-Test and Two Sided Probability for Both Participant and Non-Participant Groups (7 Point Scale).....	113
19	General Demographic Information: Means, Standard Deviations, Welch's T-Test and Two Sided Probability for Both Participant and Non-Participant Groups.....	114
20	Inter-Rater Reliability for FSE, CSE, and AP Interviews: Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients.....	118

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

I. INTRODUCTION AND IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

Why is it that some children elect to participate in sports while other children want no part of sports participation? This question has obvious importance for not only physical education and recreation, but also for the health and welfare of the nation. The Honourable John Munro, Minister of National Health and Welfare, addressed himself to this problem when he presented A Proposed Sports Policy for Canadians which stated: "Our policy is about people... the greatest number of Canadians possible... increasing their participation in sports and recreational activities, and improving the benefits they can enjoy from such participation" (1970:1).

It is toward this end that this initial investigation is devoted.

In order to move towards this end it is important to know what motivates people to participate in sports and recreational activities. It is equally important to identify factors which detract from one's desire to participate. At the present time very little is known about why certain individuals participate in sport while other individuals do not participate. Although there is a great deal of speculation it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to find research which

focuses on this problem.

If one studies involvement in sport from a temporal perspective, he can ask firstly, how people become involved, and secondly, why people persist in being involved, and finally how they become uninvolved (Kenyon and Schutz, 1970). Consequently by studying involvement over time, one may logically begin with an investigation concerning how people become socialized into sport. It is particularly important to focus an initial investigation upon lower age categories because so many attitudes and behavioral patterns are established during childhood. This study will attempt to account for the process whereby certain eight- and nine-year old boys become and remain participants in organized, competitive sport, while their peers do not.

The investigation falls into two major areas of inquiry, the individual and his social environment. In a sense, it is proposed to look at the internal framework from which the individual operates as well as the external framework which operates on the individual. Factors which appear to influence early participation in sport will be studied from within each of these frameworks.

If some light can be shed on the phenomenon of participation in sport, it may be possible to apply this knowledge to the field in order to maximize participation and to maximize individual benefits from participation. A study of this nature can give one a better indication of how to operate in the child's best interest with regard to motivation, program and

personnel.

II. THE PROBLEM

1. Statement of the Problem: The central purpose of the study was to explore the question of why some children elected to participate in organized competitive sport and others did not. In order to structure this question more specifically, the following comparisons were made:
 - A. A comparison of the family sports environment of children who elected to participate in sport with the family sports environment of children who did not elect to participate in sport.
 - B. A comparison of the child sports environment of children who elected to participate in sport with the child sports environment of children who did not elect to participate in sport.
 - C. A comparison of the home environments of children who elected to participate in sport with the home environment of children who did not elect to participate in sport.
 - D. A comparison of the personality traits of children who elected to participate in sport with the personality traits of children who did not elect to participate in sport.
 - E. A comparison of the early activity patterns of children who elected to participate in sport with the early activity patterns of children who did not elect to participate in sport.
 - F. A comparison of the present activity patterns of children who elected to participate in sport with the present activity patterns of children who did not elect to participate in sport.
 - G. A comparison of the active and quiet interests of children who elected to participate in sport with the active and quiet interests of children who did not elect to participate in sport.

- H. A comparison of the self concept of children who elected to participate in sport with the self concept of children who did not elect to participate in sport.
 - I. A comparison of the self perception of sports ability of children who elected to participate in sport with the self perception of sports ability of children who did not elect to participate in sport.
 - J. A comparison of the sports attitudes of parents who had children who elected to participate in sport with the sports attitudes of parents who had children who did not elect to participate in sport.
 - K. A comparison of the attitudes about sports of children who elected to participate in sport with the attitudes of children who did not elect to participate in sport.
2. Hypotheses: In order to analyze the above comparisons, the following research hypotheses were formulated:
- A. The primary sports involvement of parents with children who elect to participate in sport will be greater than the primary sports involvement of parents with children who do not elect to participate in sport.
 - B. The secondary sports involvement of parents with children who elect to participate in sport will be greater than the secondary sports environment of parents with children who do not elect to participate in sport.
 - C. Parental athletic aspirations and expectations for the child will be greater for the parents with children who elect to participate in sport than for the parents with children who do not elect to participate in sport.
 - D. Parental encouragement for sports participate will be greater for parents with children who elect to participate in sport than for parents with children who do not elect to participate in sport.
 - E. Children who elect to participate in sport will have more positive expectations from participation than children who do not elect to participate in sport.
 - F. Children who elect to participate in sport will have perceptions of parental expectations for participation while children who do not elect to participate will have no such perceptions.

- G. Children who elect to participate in sport will have higher athletic aspirations than children who do not elect to participate in sport.
- H. Secondary sports involvement will be greater for children who elect to participate than for children who do not elect to participate in sport.
- I. Children who do not elect to participate in sport will come from more dependency fostering-overprotective home environments than children who elect to participate in sport.
- J. Children who elect to participate in sport will be more sociable, more dominant, more aggressive, more enthusiastic, more toughminded, more confident, more vigorous, more ready to go with a group, and more venturesome, than children who do not elect to participate in sport (as measured by the CPQ).
- K. Children who elect to participate in sport will have been more physically active during infancy and early childhood than children who do not elect to participate in sport (as reported by the mother).
- L. Children who elect to participate in sport will be generally more active than children who do not elect to participate in sport.
- M. Children who elect to participate in sport will have a greater number of active interests than children who do not elect to participate in sport.
- N. Children who do not elect to participate in sport will have a greater number of quiet interests than children who elect to participate in sport.
- O. Children who elect to participate in sport will have higher self concepts than children who do not elect to participate in sport.
- P. Children who elect to participate in sport will have a more positive perception of their sports ability than children who do not elect to participate in sport.
- Q. Mothers of children who elect to participate in sport will have a more positive attitude about sports than mothers of children who do not elect to participate in sport.
- R. Fathers of children who elect to participate in sport will have a more positive attitude about sports than fathers of children who do not elect to participate in sport.

- S. Children who elect to participate in sport will have a more positive attitude about sports than children who do not elect to participate in sport.

III. DELIMITATIONS

1. The sampling of subjects was limited to thirty-two, grade three and four boys from the City of Edmonton. These eight- and nine-year old boys were selected from a middle class community where both sports programs and facilities were readily available to all community members. The subjects (sixteen participants and sixteen non-participants) included in the study had intact families, that is both mother and father living at home.
2. The type of sport participant included in the study was limited to organized, competitive hockey participants who had participated in hockey before and had elected to participate again this season.

IV. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Active Play. Active play refers to independent activities plus competitive and non-competitive group sports which require a great deal of energy such as running, skating, swimming or playing baseball.

Child Sports Environment. Child Sports Environment refers to the child's primary and secondary involvement in sport, athletic aspirations, expectations from participation, child's perception of parental expectations, and the general position of sport in the child's life.

Early Activity Pattern. The child's level of activity or energy during the first few years of life and during early childhood as reported by the mother.

Family Sports Environment. Family Sports Environment refers to parental primary and secondary involvement in sport, parental athletic expectations and aspirations for the child, parental encouragement for participation, and parents general views concerning sport.

Level of Activity. Level of activity refers to one's level of activation, alertness, or energy. Low level of activity is synonymous with being sluggish, passive and inactive. High level of activity is equated with high energy level, very active, "doing something" most of the time.

Non-Participant. A child who is not actively and formally involved in an organized sport as a player.

Organized Sport. A competitive, institutionalized game demanding the demonstration of physical skill. Participants in organized sport are placed on teams within a structured league wherein they practice and compete against other teams on a very regular basis.

Parental Participation Patterns. The amount of time per week that the parents engage in physical activity. (Restricted to Primary Involvement).

Parental Spectation Patterns. The amount of time per week that the parents spend watching sports. (Restricted to Secondary Involvement).

Participant. A child who had been actively and formally

involved in organized hockey (as a player) and who elected to become involved again this season.

Personality Traits. Operationally defined as those personality dimensions or mental structures measured by the CPQ.

Primary Involvement. Actual participation as a player, contestant or athlete.

Quiet Play. Independent "things to do" of a passive nature such as collecting things, figuring out puzzles, and playing games like checkers.

Secondary Involvement. The consumption of sport as a spectator in the audience, or as a consumer of the mass media.

Self Concept. Self concept is a feeling, perception or attitude toward the self. High self concept indicates that the individual has a positive view of himself while low self concept implies that he has a negative view of himself.

Socialization. The process whereby a person acquires sensitivity to social stimuli and learns to get along with, and behave like, others in his group or culture; the social process whereby persons learn to become participants in their society.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature has been broadly divided into five main areas; the first section dealing with socialization and behavioral acquisition, the second section with expectancy as a motivational component, the third with personality and its relation to sports participation, the fourth with self concept formulation and its effect upon participation, and the fifth section dealing with level of activity as a behavioral determinant. The major concepts were presented within a theoretical framework and followed by a review of relevant research. An attempt was also made to place each concept directly into a sports perspective.

I. SOCIALIZATION AND BEHAVIORAL ACQUISITION

Socialization and the Family

A child's behavior is a function of his biological nature and the learning that results from interaction with his environment, particularly his social environment. Most of a child's desires, skills, values, and attitudes are learned within his social environment and have a direct influence upon his behavior. People, especially those who are in some way significant to a child, are his primary sources of motivations, fears, and rewards (Mussen, Conger, and Kagan, 1963). Each child acquires facets of the self which can be traced to

contact with significant others (models) in his environment (McNeil, 1969).

Models are utilized in all cultures to promote the acquisition of socially sanctioned behavior patterns (Bandura and Walters, 1963). A child is continually taking the attitudes and emulating the behavior of those around him, particularly those who in some sense control him and on whom he depends (Mead, 1934). In a child's early years the parents are the most contagious models of behavior or the primary agents of socialization (McNeil, 1969). This is exemplified by the fact that children frequently reproduce not only the appropriate adult-role behavior patterns of their parents but also reproduce such things as parental attitudes, mannerisms, gestures and even voice inflections which the parents have never attempted to teach directly (Bandura and Walters, 1963). The tendency of the child to incorporate parental attitudes and values reaches its maximum point at approximately eight- or nine-years of age, which is before the peer group makes its full impact on the child (Wolf, 1964; Williamson, 1966).

The rôle of the family in socializing a child involves teaching him about the real world, about the behavior expected of him in it, about who and what he is, and about what other people are like. Identification and imitation are the two indirect means by which the young are socialized in the family in early life, and later in the society (McNeil, 1969). Both concepts encompass the same behavioral phenomenon, namely the tendency for an individual to reproduce the actions, attitudes,

or emotional responses exhibited by real-life or symbolized models (Bandura and Walters, 1963). Attitudes are apparently more communicable through indirect rather than direct stimulation. For example, if persons around a child are interested in and enjoy activities, the child falls readily into the pattern. However, if people around a child are uninterested or dislike activities, the probability of interest on the part of the child is greatly diminished (Pressy and Kuhlén, 1957).

The models and reinforcements to which a child is exposed during his early years are extremely important due to the fact that basic orientation toward experience is established early in life. Failure to establish interests in childhood and youth "often results in significant gaps persisting throughout life" (Pressy and Kuhlén, 1957:426). This finding was supported by the Fels longitudinal studies which indicated that children who adopted traditional masculine (athletics, mechanics, competitiveness) or feminine (gardening, cooking, sewing) activities during the early school years retained this orientation through adolescence and adulthood (Mussen, Conger and Kagan, 1963).

The literature on socialization and behavior acquisition seems to indicate that a child becomes socialized into sport in much the same manner that one becomes socialized into any mode of behavior. The implication being that learning a sport role is largely dependent upon the models available to the child and the reinforcements to which the child is exposed. When a child is young the parents are reported to be extremely

important factors in providing models for emulation as well as reinforcements. According to the principles of role theory, a boy identifies with his father because in the child's eyes he is very powerful in controlling both rewards and punishment (Mussen, 1967). Love, affection, approval, attention, and praise serve as extremely effective incentives for children (Pressy and Kuhlen, 1957; McNeil, 1969). From a social learning perspective, the desire for a young child to participate in sport arises largely from the desire to please his parents (or significant others) who encourage this motive and an identification with parents who are effective models of sporting behavior.

Dependency Fostering Home Environment

Levy (1943), Moss and Kagan (1958), Witkin et al. (1962), Bing (1963), Ferguson (1966), Denton (1967), Dawson (1967), Dyk (1967), and Honzik (1967) all support the finding that dependency fostering-overprotective home environments tend to favor verbal development at the expense of spatial and non-verbal abilities. Consistent cautiousness training and structuring of situations to avoid any potential dangers or embarrassment for the child is normally construed to be a dependency fostering-overprotective environment. Watkin (1962) maintained that children in overprotective, dependency fostering homes did not acquire the self discipline required to do non-verbal tasks.

Dependency fostering and overprotection are negatively

related to spatial abilities, non-verbal abilities, and self discipline, all of which may possibly play a role in sports participation. Furthermore it seems unlikely that a young child from a dependency fostering-overprotective home would be subjected to a relatively unprotected sports environment and questionable whether he would want to be. This would appear to be especially true of sports where the child's safety may be in jeopardy, such as ice hockey.

Family Related Research

Studies investigating the families from which athletic participants emerged have revealed the following information. Rarick and McKee (1949) found that third graders with high motor proficiency had parents who were highly active in sport; whereas, very few parents of children with low motor proficiency participated in any type of athletic activity. Ninety percent of the high motor proficiency group had one or both parents active in sports compared with 30 percent for the low motor proficiency group. Parental participation in the child's play activity was non-existent for the low motor proficiency group while it occurred in 80 percent of the cases in the high motor proficiency group. Skubic (1956) found that parents approved wholeheartedly of little league and middle league baseball for their sons. They felt that these programs were positive factors in contributing to their sons' development. La Place (1954) found that baseball players came from significantly larger families than the normal population. He

also found that major league players started playing baseball at a significantly earlier age than minor league players.

Ruffer (1965) found that the degree of parental encouragement to participate was highly significant for physically active high school students. The degree of physical activity of the father and brother was also significantly higher for the active group. Similarly, Behrman (1967) found that non-swimmers had parents who were non-swimmers twice as often as swimmers.

Malumphy (1968) found that women participating in sports reported a greater percentage of mothers currently participating in sports. She also found that 70 percent of her sample of 170 women athletes reported that "significant others" in their lives approved and encouraged their participation and competition. In this context it is interesting to note that Bird (1970) found women team sport athletes (i.e., hockey and basketball) rated their fathers more highly than their mothers on a preference scale, whereas female individual sport athletes rated their mothers higher than their fathers.

Studies investigating the families from which athletic participants emerged seem to indicate that (1) athletic children have parents who are themselves active, and/or (2) athletic children have parents (or significant others) who encourage their participation.

II. EXPECTANCY

Whether an individual pursues a particular course of action (in this case sport) depends largely upon his expectations (Manis and Meltzer, 1968). Each situation is approached with a set of expectations, some of which are positive and some of which are negative. Whether the action occurs or not depends on the relative strength of each (Birch and Veroff, 1966). Furthermore, if transactions actually take place as anticipated, the original perspective is reinforced (Manis and Meltzer, 1968).

Bandura and Walters (1963) pointed out that the probability of the occurrence of a given behavior is determined not only by the expectancy that the behavior will be reinforced, but also by the value of the reinforcer to the individual. A child is forced to anticipate how significant other individuals will react to his behavior in order to behave in the appropriate manner (McNeil, 1969). Consequently a child may engage in activities that are attractive to significant other people in order to gain acceptance and approval from them (Birch and Veroff, 1966).

Negative expectancies are as critical as positive expectancies in shaping a child's behavior, as is clearly expressed in the following quotation:

"Educators have been guilty of minimizing the critical role which a child's expectancy of failure plays in shaping his behavior in a school situation. The child's motives are contingent on expectations of success or failure, and motives are sloughed or adopted

with zeal depending on the degree to which the child believes he can attain the goals that gratify the motive" (Kagan, 1966:100).

The motivational literature previously cited seems to indicate that a child approaches sport as he approaches many environmental situations, with expectancies of both positive and negative consequences. If he chooses to become involved in a sport, it is probably because he expects that engaging in the activity will lead to positive consequences. On the other hand, if the child expects that engaging in a sport will lead to negative consequences (e.g., failure), he will probably not become involved in the sport.

III. PERSONALITY

Personality is one of the most comprehensive of all psychological concepts, encompassing as it does the complex of characteristics that distinguish one person from another (Humphreys, Traxler, and North, 1967). There are a great variety of scientific definitions and popular meanings which are attributed to the term personality. For the purposes of this discussion, personality can be thought of as representing the essence of the individual or what is most typical and characteristic of him. In more concrete terms personality consists of a set of scores or descriptive phrases which are used to describe an individual according to particular variables, traits, or dimensions (Hall and Lindzey, 1970).

Personality Traits of Athletes

Many studies have been done which compare the personality traits of athletes and non-athletes at the high school and college level. Some of the basic trait findings of these studies are categorized below.

From a review of the literature, the two areas of personality which were most often reported as being significantly different for athletes as compared to non-athletes were sociability (Carter and Shannon, 1940; Biddulph, 1954; Marks, 1954; Werner, 1960; Ruffer, 1965; Schendel, 1965; Groves, 1966; Werner and Gottheil, 1966; Behrman, 1967; Ikegami, 1970), and dominance (Booth, 1958; Thorpe, 1958; Merriman, 1960; Werner, 1960; Tillman, 1964; Johnson, 1966; Werner and Gottheil, 1966; Brunner, 1969; Singer, 1969; Kane, 1970). Other personality traits found to distinguish athletes from non-athletes which seemed closely related and supportive to sociability and dominance were extraversion (Sperling, 1942; Tillman, 1964; Ruffer, 1965; Whiting and Stemberge, 1965; Brunner, 1969; Ikegami, 1970), ascendancy (Sperling, 1942; Thorpe, 1958; Merriman, 1960; Tillman, 1964; Johnson, 1966), self confidence (Johnson, Hutton, and Johnson, 1954; Merriman, 1960; Groves, 1966; Kroll, 1967; Brunner, 1969), and high self concept (Wilkin, 1964; Schendel, 1965; Rosen and Ross, 1968; Schendel, 1970).

Several independent researchers also found athletes to be significantly different from non-athletes on the following personality characteristics: aggressiveness (Johnson, Hutton, and Johnson, 1954; La Place, 1954; Tillman, 1964; Ikegami,

1970), enthusiasm (Werner, 1960; Tillman, 1964; Ruffer, 1965; Werner and Gottheil, 1966), group dependence (Werner, 1960; Tillman, 1964; Werner and Gottheil, 1966; Kane, 1970), conventionality (Werner, 1960; Schendel, 1965; Werner and Gottheil, 1966), masculinity (Slusher, 1964; Kroll, 1967; Schendel, 1970), and toughness (Werner, 1960; Werner and Gottheil, 1966; Kroll, 1967).

Personality-Participation Relationship

It has been suggested that the significant differences in personality test scores of athletes were due to one of the following assumptions:

Assumption #1. Sports participation influences the personality structure.

Assumption #2. Individuals with certain personality structures elect to participate in sports (Werner and Gottheil, 1966; Kroll, 1967).

Two longitudinal studies have shed light upon the area where future research is most needed to test these assumptions. Werner and Gottheil (1966) found that prior non-athletes did not become more like athletes as a result of participation in an extensive four year (USMA) college athletic program. Those who had been high school athletes were found to be more sociable, enthusiastic, conservative, group dependent, and lax upon entrance and at graduation when compared to prior non-participants. No evidence was found in this study to support the assumption that college athletics significantly influences the personality structure. The authors suggested that further

research in this area is highly warranted for lower age groups.

The second longitudinal study by Schendel (1970) indicated that high school athletes had a significantly higher degree of personal worth and self acceptance at both grade nine and grade twelve. He maintained that whatever produced these differences between athletes and non-athletes had their major influence prior to grade nine.

It is obvious from these longitudinal studies that in order to test the aforementioned directional assumptions, a study is needed which focuses on young participants and non-participants in sports (i.e., eight- and nine-year olds) over at least a short period of time.

Personality Research with Athletic Children

Very few research studies have been conducted which explore the personality traits of athletic children. Those studies which have investigated the problem were subjective in their orientation and were generally completed in the 1950's. Keeping these facts in mind some of the pertinent findings of these studies are briefly explained below.

Seymour (1956) conducted a study on 10-12 year old participants in little league baseball. Teachers subjectively rated the participants higher on every personality trait (co-operation, social consciousness, emotional adjustment, leadership, and responsibility) in both pre-season and post-season tests. However, only leadership was significantly higher for the participants. In terms of social acceptance from peers

the participants received significantly higher ratings from both boys and girls on both pre-season and post-season tests. The hypothesis that participants would make greater advances in terms of acceptance from pre-season to post-season was rejected.

The major hypothesis of the study, that greater improvement in the behavior characteristics under examination would be made by the participants during the course of the study, was not supported by the data, except in the area of leadership. From this study it appears that 10-12 year old baseball players begin playing with a higher level of social acceptance and more desirable personality traits than their non-participating peers. However, it is not known whether the subjects in this study had been participating since the age of eight or whether this was their first encounter with a little league team.

Skubic (1956) found that teachers rated little league and middle league baseball players as being better adjusted socially and emotionally than boys who were not members of teams. The players also received significantly higher grades in physical education when compared to the non-players. Brown (1970) studied the relationship between emotional adjustment and rating on a physical performance test for children aged 9-12. He found that physical performance and emotional adjustment were not highly related.

Rarick and McKee (1949) utilized the case study technique to investigate the personal characteristics of ten children

of high and ten children of low motor proficiency, all of whom were in the third grade. As subjectively evaluated by the teacher, children in the superior motor proficiency group tended to be popular, active, calm, resourceful, attentive, cooperative, and leaders. Children in the inferior motor proficiency group were more often found to be shy, retiring, tense, imaginative, and followers.

Tuddenham (1951) found that athletic skills, leadership, and daring were associated with popularity in young boys. The most highly esteemed boys in grade one were those whom their peers considered good at games, good sports, 'real boys', not bashful, and daring. The most important correlates of popularity with grade three boys were fairness in play and leadership ability. Hahn (1970) used a sociogram on boys aged 10-12 and found that physical fitness and sports played a significant role in their social order.

The previously discussed studies seem to indicate that participant and non-participant children exhibited different personality traits at a very early age. It seems probable that these differences existed before the children began participating in organized sport.

IV. SELF CONCEPT

Each individual has attitudes, feelings, and perceptions of himself which are known as his self concept. The feelings which others have toward the individual play an important part

in shaping his perception of self, or self concept. In turn the self concept plays a significant role in shaping one's behavior (Secord and Backman, 1964; Rosenberg, 1965; Thomas, 1971).

People constantly receive evaluation from others and one's estimate of his own worth or ability is inferred from the words or gestures of other people. People have a tendency to anticipate and adjust their behavior to the expectations of others, particularly significant others (Jones and Gerard, 1967; Manis and Meltzer, 1968).

Self Concept and Participation

Rosenberg (1965) found that adolescents with negative self concepts or low self esteem tended to be shy, anxious, docile, awkward, and neurotic. The lower the individual's self esteem, the less likely he was found to be a highly active participant in extracurricular activities. People with low self esteem were described as being inactive, inordinately subdued, apathetic, and outstanding in their social invisibility. Contrarily, people with positive self concepts or high self esteem were much more often found to be members of school clubs and extracurricular activities. In this context it is interesting to note the contention held by Rosen and Ross (1968) that feelings about the body are commensurate with feelings about the self.

Schendel (1970), in a three year longitudinal study of the psychological characteristics of participant and non-

participants in athletics, concluded that the athletic group had a significantly higher sense of personal worth and self acceptance in both grade nine and grade twelve. Schendel postulated that whatever factors produced these differences between athletes and non-athletes, had their major influence prior to high school years. In an earlier study, Schendel (1965) found that both junior and senior high school athletes were significantly different from non-athletes with regard to self acceptance and feelings of personal worth. Wilkin (1964) also found participants in inter-school athletics to have higher self concepts than non-participants in athletics.

Self Concept - Participation Relationship

The same type of question that arose in discussing the personality-participation relationship arises here. Does participation in extracurricular activities enhance one's self concept and self esteem or do people with high self regard elect to be involved and active? Do young children with low self esteem or low self concept tend to be inactive and non-participating? Is this a factor influencing early participation in sport?

While participation in sport provides opportunities for the enhancement of one's self concept and self esteem by positive feedback from others, it may also be a factor influencing original participation. There are three characteristics of people with low self esteem which could account for why they are less likely to participate: (1) they feel threatened by

others, (2) they doubt whether they have much worthwhile to contribute, (3) they are self conscious about performing in front of others (Rosenberg, 1965).

V. LEVEL OF ACTIVITY

Everyone has a normal, usual, or customary level of activation which is a core characteristic of his personality. Level of activation refers to one's level of excitement, alertness, or energy and is said to become relatively fixed during the childhood years. According to Fiske's and Maddi's activation theory, people have a tendency to maintain the level of activation to which they are accustomed. It is this tendency which plays a major role in motivating an individual to select and maintain either tension increasing or tension reducing activities (Maddi, 1968).

Thomas, Chess and Birch (1970) conducted a ten year longitudinal study which appears to have some implications for the above theory. Based on the behavioral patterns of 141 infants, they concluded that children show distinct individuality in temperament in the first few weeks of life, independently of their parents handling or personality style. Their long term study has also shown that the original characteristics of temperament appear to persist in most children over the years. For example, children exhibiting high activity levels and low activity levels are markedly different within the first few months of life and these differences tend to

remain fairly constant through the following ten years. This tendency is clarified by the verbal descriptions on the following chart:

<u>Age</u>	<u>High Activity Level</u>	<u>Low Activity Level</u>
2 months	Moves often in sleep. Wiggles when diaper is changed.	Does not move when being dressed or during sleep.
6 months	Tries to stand in bath and splashes. Bounces in crib. Crawls after dog.	Passive in bath. Plays quietly in crib and falls asleep.
1 year	Walks rapidly. Eats eagerly. Climbs into everything.	Finishes bottle slowly. Goes to sleep easily. Allows nail cutting without fussing.
2 years	Climbs furniture. Explores. Gets in and out of bed while being put to sleep.	Enjoys quiet play with puzzles. Can listen to records for hours.
5 years	Leaves table often during meals. Always runs.	Takes a long time to dress. Sits quietly on long automobile rides.
10 years	Plays ball and engages in other sports. Cannot sit long enough to do homework.	Likes chess and reading. Eats very slowly.

The concept of early patterns of activity influencing a child's present patterns of activity was introduced to physical education circles by Rarick and McKee in 1949. These researchers conducted case studies on grade three children with superior motor proficiency and inferior motor proficiency. Upon interviewing the families of the subjects, they found that during the period of early childhood, the inferior group

had shown a preference for fine manipulative activity of a passive nature, whereas, the superior group, even at an early age, leaned toward gross motor skills. Ninety percent of the superior proficiency group were walking by one year while only 30 percent of the inferior proficiency group has accomplished this. The superior motor proficiency group chose primarily active games as their after school activities, whereas members of the inferior group more frequently selected passive activities. Eighty percent of the superior group usually engaged in group play activities, whereas, 90 percent of the inferior group confined their play associates to one or two pals. McNeil (1969) contended that through play the child sorts out roles most congruent to his basic temperament and abilities and those that promise him the reward and approval of others.

It appears that one's early level or pattern of activity plays an important role in determining his activity patterns later in life. One's level of activity would appear to make him either more or less susceptible to participation in sports. For example, an individual with a high energy level who likes to be doing something active most of the time is probably more likely to become a sports participant than a person who is generally sluggish and inactive.

In light of the research findings and theoretical formulations discussed in the review of the literature, it is apparent that many factors may influence a child's decision to participate in sports. Socialization literature emphasizes the importance of significant models and reinforcements, while

related literature points to the importance of expectancy, personality, self concept, and level of activity as behavioral determinants. A most difficult task concerns the problem of measuring these factors in a meaningful way, which is the focus of the next chapter.

CHAPTER III

INSTRUMENTS

I. SELECTION AND CONSTRUCTION

After outlining the problem to be investigated and reviewing relevant literature and research, several factors were isolated which were thought to play a major role in determining whether or not a child would participate in sport. These factors were identified primarily from literature concerned with socialization, behavioral acquisition, personality, and child development. The next immediate consideration was one of determining how these factors, which appeared to shed light on the problem, could be measured. After thoroughly searching through available research tools, it was decided that in order to get at the root of this problem it was absolutely essential to construct instruments specifically designed to deal with this problem. It was also thought that certain carefully selected standardized instruments would prove to be of value.

The research instruments selected can be outlined under two major headings: (1) Children's Research Instruments, and (2) Parents' Research Instruments. Six basic research instruments were utilized to collect information from the children and six instruments were utilized for the parents. The types of measures obtained, the means by which they were obtained, and their approximate administration times are

presented on page 30.

II. GENERAL INTERVIEW INFORMATION

It was felt that interviews concerned with the child's sports environment (CSE) and the family's sports environment (FSE) would get at the heart of the problem being investigated. Consequently, instruments were developed which could conceivably measure these environments. In order to reduce the subjectivity and bias on the part of the interviewer and yet maintain the needed flexibility, a depth interview, as outlined by Good and Scates (1954), was chosen for utilization. The interview was constructed in a manner which would allow pertinent qualitative information to be attained and easily quantified for data analysis. In order to quantify the information obtained through the interview, a five-point rating scale was designed for each question. Each numerical point on the scale was given a verbal description based on the types of responses that warranted particular ratings.

The interview schedule consisted of specific questions about particular types of behavior and conditions which were conceived to be representative of different environments (i.e., positive or negative sports environments). The questions were selected on the basis of theoretical and empirical work done in the areas of child psychology and physical education with particular emphasis being paid to literature on

CHILDREN'S RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

<u>Measurement</u>	<u>Instrument</u>	<u>Approximate Time</u>
Child's Sports Environment	Orlick CSE focused interview	20 to 30 minutes per individual
Self Concept	The Thomas Self Concept Values Test (interview)	20 to 25 minutes per individual
Self Perception of Sports Ability	Orlick SPSA (adaptation of TSC interview)	3 minutes per individual
Child's Attitudes about Sports	Orlick interview (adaptation of semantic differential)	5 to 10 minutes per individual
Active and Quiet Interests	SRA Children's Interest Inventory	20 minutes per group
Personality Traits	Children's Personality Questionnaire (CPQ)	50 minutes per group for each of two forms

PARENTS' RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

<u>Measurement</u>	<u>Instrument</u>	<u>Approximate Time</u>
Family Sports Environment	Orlick FSE focused interview	25 minutes per mother
Dependency Fostering-Overprotective Home Environment	Mosychuk DFO interview	15 minutes per mother
Early Activity Patterns (of Child)	Orlick questionnaire and interview	6 minutes per mother
Present Activity Patterns (of Child)	Orlick questionnaire and interview	6 minutes per mother
Attitudes about Sports (Parents)	Semantic Differential (adapted from Snider and Osgood, and Kenyon)	5 minutes per parent
General Information (Parents socio-economic status)	GIP Questionnaire; Blishen Social Class Index	5 minutes

socialization and child development. A preliminary draft was examined by an expert (psychologist) in the field of interviewing and test construction as well as by an expert (sport psychologist) in the field of physical education. The interview schedule was subsequently revised and utilized in a pilot study. As a result of the pilot study, further revisions were made which included the addition of certain questions as well as the alteration or elimination of other questions. Two additional interviews were constructed by the researcher in essentially the same manner as outlined above. These interviews were very brief and were concerned with the child's early activity patterns and present activity patterns.

It was necessary to interview both the child and a member of his family to obtain the fundamental information needed in this study. The child was the only individual who could relay his own phenomenological view of the sports scene. It was therefore deemed important to allow the child to express in his own words such things as his athletic aspirations and expectations, his sports involvement and his perception of the place of sports in his life. Interviews were also conducted with each of the mothers who were assumed to possess the family information required and who were reportedly more available for interviews. These assumptions were supported by Hoffman and Lippitt (1960) who stated that mothers were both more available and better informed than fathers, especially with respect to the family environment and the child's early years. Further support for inter-

viewing the mother came from Honzik (1967) who maintained that a parent feels more responsible for rearing his own sex child and that questions about upbringing are usually more threatening to same sex parents. He concluded that parents responding to questions about same sex offspring will more likely be defensive and give distorted, socially acceptable responses. Considering the fact that mothers are more available, better informed, and less threatened in responding to questions about their sons, it was decided that, for this study, the mothers would be the most valid source of information concerning home environment, family sports environment and child's interaction with his physical environment.

The entire proceedings of all interviews were recorded on tape and subsequently transcribed to facilitate scoring and to ensure that nothing was omitted. Information pertaining to the validity and reliability of the interview schedules has been presented in Chapter V.

III. CHILDREN'S RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Child Sports Environment Interview (CSE)

The Child Sports Environment (CSE) Interview schedule consisted of thirty-two questions (twenty-one having two parts) which described six aspects of the child's sports environment in terms of environmental or behavioral processes. The six areas of investigation included:

A. Primary Sports Involvement of Child (PIC).

- B. Secondary Sports Involvement of Child (SIC).
- C. General Sports Information (GSI).
- D. Child's Athletic Aspirations (CAA).
- E. Child's Expectations from Participation (CE).
- F. Child's Perception of Parental Expectations (CPPE).

Each area of investigation was comprised of several specific questions about particular types of behaviors and conditions which represented different kinds of environments. The qualitative responses to the questions were assigned a numerical rating wherever possible. A high score (5) was indicative of a positive response to a question while a low score (1) indicated that the response was negative. The quantified responses concerned with each area being investigated were totaled in order to obtain the six area scores (A-F). A total CSE score was then obtained by adding all the scores of the six areas. Participants and non-participants were compared on each question, on each area, as well as on the total CSE score. Qualitative information from open ended questions (which could not be quantified) was either quoted directly or presented in percentage form where feasible.

The rationale underlying this instrument as well as the means by which it was constructed has already been discussed under general interview information. The actual interview questions along with the scoring key, can be found in Section I of Appendix A.

The Thomas Self Concept Values Test (TSC)

The purpose of this instrument was to provide a psychological technique for assessing the personal self concept values of primary aged children (Thomas, 1971).

The questions regarding self values which were asked of the children included:

1. How do you suppose your mother perceives you?
2. How do you suppose your teacher perceives you?
3. How do you suppose your classmates perceive you?
4. How do you perceive yourself?

(a) Procedure. A polaroid photograph was taken of each child and given to him to assist him in gaining "objectivity" about himself. "Objectivity" was defined here as perception of the self as an "object". After taking the photograph the subjects were asked to report:

1. Their perceptions of the ways in which they supposed they were seen by each of the significant other referents (mother, teacher, other kids in the class), and
2. Their perception of themselves.

(b) Scoring. Fourteen bi-polar adjectival items constituted the representative self value dimensions on which subjects reported their perceptions. These items were stated in the vocabulary of the children. All items were presented in an either-or format, the more socially keyed choice being scored +1 and the less socially keyed choice being scored -1. If the subject did not respond on a given item, N was scored for no response.

Further information concerning the Thomas Self Concept Values Test can be found in Section II of Appendix A.

Self Perception of Sports Ability

By adding a fifteenth factor to the Thomas Self Concept Values Test (TSC), an attempt was made to obtain a measure of the child's self perception of sports ability. The additional factor concerned specifically with sports was keyed as follows:

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Keying Weights</u>
Factor 15: Sports	Good at sports	+1
	Not very good at sports	-1

The following four questions were included in the TSC interview in order to investigate the sports factor:

1. Is (insert child's name) good at sports or not very good at sports?
2. Does _____'s mother think he is good at sports or not very good at sports?
3. Does _____'s teacher think he is good at sports or not very good at sports?
4. Do the other kids in the class think that _____ is good at sports or not very good at sports?

The administration and scoring of these four items was identical to the procedure followed with the Thomas Self Concept Values Test. For example, a positive response was given a weighting of +1 while a negative response was weighted -1. The raw scores on this factor had a maximum range extending from -4 to +4 (as did the TSC value scores). The only devia-

tion from the Thomas format was that raw scores were utilized for data analysis rather than standard scores.

Children's Attitudes about Sport Interview (AAS-C)

A semantic differential preference scale adapted from Snider and Osgood (1969), and Kenyon (1968), was utilized to obtain an indication of the child's attitudes about sports. However, it was found in a pilot study that eight- and nine-year old boys had difficulty completing this type of scale in questionnaire form. Consequently, it was decided that the attitude inventory should be administered verbally in an interview setting.

The interview procedure followed is outlined below:

I want you to tell me what you think about sports (or how you feel about sports) by answering some questions:

Number 1: Good versus Bad

Question 1: Do you think sports are good, or bad, or in between?

Answer A: If the child answered in between or don't know, he received a numerical rating of four.

Answer B: If the child answered either good or bad, he was asked another question concerning the degree of goodness or badness (i.e., slightly, pretty, or very). For example, if a child answered that he thought sports were good, the interviewer then asked: Do you think sports are slightly good, pretty good, or very good. Depending on his

response he was scored a 5, 6 or 7, respectively.

The outline of the scoring key for number 1, good versus bad was as follows:

- 7 indicated that the child thought sports were very good
- 6 indicated that the child thought sports were pretty good
- 5 indicated that the child thought sports were slightly good
- 4 indicated that the child thought sports were in between, not good and not bad (4 also indicated don't know, don't understand word and word doesn't fit into sports)
- 3 indicated that the child thought sports were slightly bad
- 2 indicated that the child thought sports were pretty bad
- 1 indicated that the child thought sports were very bad.

The same procedure was followed with all eight sets of word choices which made up the attitude inventory. By administering this instrument in the form of an interview, the information overload previously placed on the child was reduced. The maximum number of choices the child had to contend with at any one time was three. This enabled the child to cope with a previously unmanageable problem. There was no need for the child to see all the confusing words and numbers. Consequently, a modified semantic differential approach based on verbal responses allowed the researcher to obtain an indication of the child's attitudes about sports. The semantic differential scale utilized in this study is outlined below.

SPORTS ARE:

1.	good	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	bad
2.	worthless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	worthwhile
3.	pleasant	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	unpleasant
4.	sour	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	sweet
5.	nice	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	awful
6.	sad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	happy
7.	clean	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	dirty
8.	relaxed	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	tense

The bi-polar adjectival choices were presented in alternating order in an attempt to reduce response set. In the final analysis a high score indicated a positive response and a low score was indicative of a negative response. Participant and non-participant groups were compared on their responses to each of the eight items which made up the attitude scale. The groups were also compared on their total attitude scores, which were obtained simply by summing the eight separate item scores.

The SRA Inventory of Children's Interests

To assess the active and passive interests of the children, the Science Research Associates (SRA) inventory of children's interests was utilized. "What I Like to Do" is an interest inventory standardized on a nationwide basis for the use in elementary school. The inventory yields an interest pattern for each child in eight significant areas

comprising both in-school and out-of-school activity preferences. The eight interest areas are: art, music, social studies, active play, quiet play, manual arts, home arts and science. Only the areas concerning active play and quiet play were utilized for the purpose of this study.

(a) Active Play. Independent activities plus competitive and non-competitive group sports were included in this area. A high score in active play indicated that the child had a lot of energy and liked to run, or skate, or swim, or play baseball.

(b) Quiet Play. This area measured preferences for both independent and group "things to do" of a less active nature. A high score in quiet play indicated that the child liked to collect things, or figure out puzzles, or play games like checkers.

Publication of "What I Like To Do" was preceded by more than five years of developmental work under the direction of the author, Louis P. Thorpe. Scoring involved merely counting the "yes" responses separately for each interest area. The reliability of the active play interest area for grade four boys is .86. The reliability of the quiet play interest area for boys in grade four is .87. The maximum possible score for active play interest is 40, and the maximum possible score for quiet play interest is 33 (Bonsall, Meyer, and Thorpe, 1954).

The items which made up the inventory administered to each child can be found in Section III of Appendix A.

The Children's Personality Questionnaire

The Children's Personality Questionnaire (CPQ) is one of a series of coordinated personality inventories extending from the pre-school to the adult level constructed by Cattell and his associates. The CPQ has been constructed to assess the personality traits of children ranging from eight years old to twelve years old. Fourteen distinct dimensions or traits of personality are measured which have been isolated through the use of factor analysis (Cattell and Porter, 1959, 1968).

Personality Traits Measured by the CPQ:

1. Factor A - sociability.
2. Factor B - intelligence.
3. Factor C - emotionality.
4. Factor D - excitability.
5. Factor E - dominance.
6. Factor F - enthusiasm.
7. Factor G - conscientiousness.
8. Factor H - venturesome versus shy.
9. Factor I - tough versus tenderminded.
10. Factor J - vigorous versus internally restrained.
11. Factor N - forthright versus shrewd.
12. Factor O - confident versus insecure.
13. Factor Q₃ - casual versus controlled.
14. Factor Q₄ - relaxed versus tense.

General information pertaining to this instrument can be found in Section IV of Appendix A.

IV. PARENTS' RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Family Sports Environment Interview (FSE)

The Family Sports Environment (FSE) interview was comprised of specific questions about particular types of behavior and conditions which were representative of positive and negative family sports environments. The FSE interview schedule consisted of twenty-seven questions (seven of which have two parts) describing five general aspects of the family sports environment in terms of environmental and behavioral processes. The five general areas of enquiry included:

- A. Primary Sports Involvement of Family (PIF).
- B. Secondary Sports Involvement of Family (SIF).
- C. Parental Expectancies and Athletic Aspirations for Child (EA).
- D. Encouragement for Participation by Parents (En).
- E. General Sports Information (GSIP).

The qualitative responses to the questions pertaining to each area of investigation were assigned a numerical rating wherever possible. A high score (5) was indicative of a positive response to a question whereas a low score (1) indicated that the response was negative. The quantified responses concerned with each of the general areas being investigated were totaled separately in order to obtain the five area scores (A-E). A total FSE score was then obtained by summing the scores of the five areas. A high FSE score indicated a positive Family Sports Environment and a low score was indicative of a negative Family Sports Environment. Partici-

pant and non-participant families were compared on each question, on each area, as well as on the total FSE score. Qualitative information which could not be quantified was either quoted directly or presented in percentage form, where feasible.

The rationale underlying this instrument as well as the means by which it was constructed has already been discussed under general interview information. The actual interview questions along with the scoring key can be found in Section I of Appendix B.

Dependency Fostering - Overprotective Home Environment Interview (DFO)

Variable seven of Mosychuk's Differential Environmental Process Variables (DEPVAR) Interview Schedule was utilized to examine the home environment with respect to dependency fostering, and the amount of overprotection of the child. Consistent cautiousness training, and structuring of situations to avoid any potential dangers or embarrassment for the child was construed to be a dependency fostering - overprotective environment. Characteristics of the home which contributed to a high dependency fostering score included such things as "doing things" for the child because he is "not old enough". The opposite end of this scale was represented by home environments where the child was permitted to try new activities or go "foreign" places at an early age. Other characteristics which contributed to a low dependency foster-

ing score included such things as low parental anxiety with respect to over-exposure of the child to degrading and dangerous elements.

Mosychuk (1969) developed the Differential Environmental Process Variables Interview Schedule (DEPVAR), as an instrument for identifying and measuring the home environment differentially in terms of dynamic process characteristics or psychological presses.

"That the DEPVAR measured home environments differentially was shown by (a) the replicated low inter-variable correlations, (b) a greatly reduced first factor unrotated variance contribution (40-50 percent compared to 75-80 percent in other studies), and (c) the replicated rotated factors which could be meaningfully interpreted" (Mosychuk, 1969: iii).

The instrument was shown to be consistent in measuring environments in different groups by the replication of the DEPVAR variable intercorrelations, and factor analysis. Interrater correlation coefficients ranged from .81 to .91 which confirmed the reliability of the scale.

The administration and scoring procedures outlined by Mosychuk were strictly adhered to. The interviews were taped and subsequently scored as was recommended. The DFO interview schedule and scoring key is located in Section II of Appendix B.

Early Activity Patterns (EAP)

The Early Activity Pattern Questionnaire (EAPQ) and the Early Activity Pattern Interview (EAPI) were concerned with measuring the child's interaction with his physical environment during the early years. Certain writers and

researchers (Maddi, 1968; Pressy and Kuhlen, 1957; Bandura and Walters, 1967; Thomas, Chess, and Birch, 1970) have reported that children exhibit individuality in activity level early in life and that this general activity level tends to persist in most children over the years. Based on this literature it was hypothesized that participant children were more active in their early years, and that they continued to exhibit these active patterns of behavior later in life, possibly through sport.

The longitudinal study conducted by Thomas, Chess, and Birch (1970) which was discussed in the review of the literature, clearly outlined how mothers described the activity patterns of their children at various age levels. The descriptions which were attributed to the active and quiet extremes of the activity scale were converted into a questionnaire for utilization in the present study. Through the use of this questionnaire, it was hoped that some insight into the early activity patterns of participant and non-participant children would be gained.

Although the reliability of maternal retrospection may be somewhat suspect (Yarrow, Campbell, and Burton, 1964), it was the only feasible means by which this data could be collected at the time. Ideally one would begin the study at birth and follow the children through the years. However for the purposes of this study, mothers rated their children with reference to early activity patterns on the basis of descriptive statements and a five point scale. The opposing

descriptive choices on which the ratings were based were presented in randomly alternating order in an attempt to reduce response set. In the final analysis a high score (5) was indicative of a positive (active) response while a low score (1) indicated a negative (quiet) response.

In addition to the EAP Questionnaire, an interview was conducted with each mother in order to attain further information concerning the child's early activity patterns. The interview allowed for more flexibility in response by enabling the interviewee to explain and clarify answers. The interview schedule was constructed and administered in essentially the same manner as the FSE and CSE interviews. Each response was assigned a numerical rating from one through five based on appropriate verbal descriptions of possible responses. The interview was taped and subsequently analyzed to ensure that nothing was omitted. The EAP Interview was administered before EAP Questionnaire so as not to provide the interviewee with ready made answers (to avoid cognitive set).

The EAP Questionnaire was comprised of six questions and the EAP Interview contained three questions. The total EAP score was obtained by summing the quantified responses of both the EAP Questionnaire and the EAP Interview. Participants and non-participants were compared on each questionnaire item and on each interview question as well as on the total EAP score. A high EAP score indicated a positive (highly active) early interaction with physical environment and a low

score was indicative of a negative (passive) early interaction with physical environment.

The Early Activity Pattern Questionnaire and The Early Activity Pattern Interview schedule can be found in Sections III and IV of Appendix B.

Present Activity Patterns (PAP)

The Present Activity Pattern Questionnaire (PAPQ) and Present Activity Pattern Interview (PAPI) were concerned with measuring the child's present interaction with his physical environment. More specifically, these instruments were designed to measure the child's general attraction to, or avoidance of, physical activity, along with related factors. The researcher was attempting to determine whether participant children were described as being generally more active, adventurous, competitive, etc. when compared to non-participant children.

The PAP Questionnaire had the same basic format as the EAP Questionnaire but was concerned with how the child presently interacted with his physical environment. Mothers rated their children on bi-polar descriptive statements referring to present activity patterns. The opposing descriptive choices were presented in randomly alternating order in an attempt to reduce response set. In the final analysis a high score (5) indicated a positive response (active) and a low score (1) was indicative of a negative response (quiet).

The PAP Interview was conducted with each mother in an

attempt to obtain less structured information concerning the same basic area of inquiry. The PAP Interview schedule was constructed and administered in essentially the same manner as the CSE, FSE, and EAP interviews. Each qualitative response was quantified on the basis of a five point scale. The PAP interview was administered before the PAP questionnaire to avoid cognitive set, which may have occurred as a result of reading the written descriptions on the questionnaire. The interview was taped and subsequently analyzed along with the other interviews.

The PAP Questionnaire was comprised of six questions and the PAP Interview contained four related questions. The total PAP score was obtained by adding the quantified responses of both the PAP Questionnaire and the PAP Interview. Participants and non-participants were compared on each questionnaire item, on each interview question, and on their total PAP score. A high PAP score was indicative of a positive (active) interaction with the physical environment while a low score indicated a negative (passive) interaction with the physical environment.

The validity and reliability of the PAP instrument has been presented in conjunction with data analysis along with other instruments created by the researcher.

The Present Activity Pattern Questionnaire and Present Activity Pattern Interview schedule can be found in Sections V and VI of Appendix B.

Attitudes about Sports (AAS-P)

A Semantic Differential Preference Scale adapted from Snider and Osgood (1969), and Kenyon (1968) was utilized to assess parental general attitudes towards sports. The semantic differential technique has been utilized with apparent success in several studies concerned with physical activity and sports (Kenyon, 1968; Alderman, 1969; Asquith, 1971). In this study a sports attitude questionnaire was administered to both the mother and father of each child in hopes of attaining an indication of their attitude toward the general concept of sports. It was hypothesized that parents of participant children had a more positive attitude toward sports than the parents of non-participant children.

The bi-polar adjectival choices which make up the semantic differential scale were presented in alternating order in an attempt to reduce response set. In the final analysis a high score was indicative of a positive attitude toward sports and a low score indicated a negative attitude toward sports. The mothers and fathers of participant and non-participant children were compared on their responses to each of the eight items utilized in this attitude scale. The groups were also compared on their total attitude scores which were obtained by adding the scores of the separate items.

The sports attitude questionnaire utilized with the parents can be found in Section VII of Appendix B.

General Information Questionnaire Parents (GIQ-P)

.The general information questionnaire (located in Section VIII of Appendix B) was adapted from similar instruments utilized by Mosychuk (1969) and Kenyon (1968). The type of information obtained through the use of this questionnaire was demographic in nature and included such things as name, address, number of children in the family, ordinal position, educational level of parents, and occupation. An essential piece of information collected through the use of this instrument concerned the husband's occupation. It was through the nature of the husband's work that the family was classified with reference to socio-economic status. An attempt was made to control for socio-economic status in the selection of the sample, however, a valid and reliable verification was needed.

Blishen (1958) constructed a socio-economic status scale suitable for use in Canada on the basis of the 1951 national census data. The mean income and number of years of schooling required for each of 343 occupations was calculated and converted into standard scores. The standard scores on the two variables were combined and averaged, which resulted in a scale ranging from thirty-two to ninety with a mean of approximately fifty and a standard deviation of ten. Blishen maintained that this scale gives predominant weight to the amount of responsibility involved in the occupation and the degree of training required. Both these factors strongly influence subjective rankings of occupations.

When Blishen's Scale was correlated with Hatt's "National Opinions Research Centre Index", a correlation of .94 was obtained. Hatt (1953) compiled an objective occupational scale by a national standardization of ninety occupations in the United States. Blishen also found a mean correlation of .85 between his Canadian index and similar scales standardized by a variety of methods in Great Britain, Germany, Japan and New Zealand.

In the course of updating and revising the original Blishen Occupational Scale, Blishen (1967) published a new scale based on 1961 census data. In the revised form, in addition to considering income and education, the Pineo-Porter occupational scale was included which is a "social standing" or "prestige" opinion measure of occupations. For the 1961 index, scores were calculated for 320 occupations and the new scale correlated .96 with the original 1951 Blishen Scale.

Because of its empirical justification and suitability for use in Canada, the updated Blishen Canadian Occupational Scale was selected to obtain an estimate of socio-economic status in the present study.

In this chapter an attempt was made to explain what each research instrument was designed to measure, as well as the rationale behind the instruments. For those instruments created or adapted to meet the specific needs of this study, additional information was given concerning the development of the instrument and the scoring procedure. The next chapter explains how the instruments were utilized in the study.

CHAPTER IV

METHODS AND PROCEDURE

I. SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE

Control of as many variables as possible was attempted in selecting the sample. Factors such as age, grade, socio-economic status, intactness of the family unit (i.e., parents alive and living together in the home), availability of community programs and facilities, and availability of school programs and facilities were controlled in the sample selection. The selected subjects lived in the same community, went to the same school, had the same teachers and received the same information concerning the opportunities available through the community league. All community members received written correspondence from the community league concerning the programs available and similar announcements were also made in the school over the public address system. The community facilities (i.e., hockey rink, baseball and soccer fields, etc.) were within easy walking distance for all subjects included in the study. Consequently all community members were informed about the programs available and the facilities were easily accessible to all subjects.

The subjects were chosen from a homogeneous upper middle class community in the City of Edmonton. An upper income level community was selected to ensure that the opportunity for participation in organized sport would be available for all

boys. This socio-economic level also ensured that all families had the necessary finances to equip their children for the sports available. Lack of facilities, lack of program, lack of information, and lack of money for equipment did not appear to be factors restricting participation in this community, as may be the case in some lower income areas.

Since this study was concerned with socio-psychological factors influencing or hindering participation, it was essential that the physical availability and opportunity for participation be equal for all subjects. In this community all boys had the opportunity to participate in organized sports. Why some boys elected to participate under these conditions while others did not was the fundamental question being investigated.

The Brookside Riverbend community, from which subjects were chosen, was located on the outskirts of the City of Edmonton and had physical boundaries which isolated it from other communities. Stretching down the entire eastern boundary of the community was a wooded ravine. Parkland areas and the Saskatchewan River extended along the northern and eastern boundaries. On the southern boundary was a road adjacent to undeveloped farm land. This residential community consisted primarily of modern one-family private homes. There were no stores located in this community. The only commercial landmark was a single gas station.

The centrally located public elementary school from which the sample was drawn was completed in 1968. Grades one

through three were taught in the traditional classroom while grades four through six were taught in an open area. There were two grade three classrooms in the school and the equivalent of two and one half grade four classes which were team taught in an open area. All 73 of the grade three and grade four boys (eight- and nine-years old) in the school were included as possible subjects.

Eight- and nine-year old boys were selected for two primary reasons. Firstly, in the City of Edmonton, it was normally possible to become involved in organized competitive sport within city leagues at either eight or nine years of age. Prior to this, house leagues are usually set up in most communities (for boys under eight years of age). Secondly, it was felt that eight- and nine-year old boys would be mature enough to reflect and respond to the interview as well as other research instruments being utilized. As the child's age decreases it becomes progressively more difficult to elicit information.

An outdoor community hockey rink was completed during the latter part of 1971, just in time for the 1971-72 hockey season. Prior to this time the children had to go to other communities to play city league hockey. The new hockey rink was situated next to the public elementary school making it easily accessible to community members. Large playing fields were also located adjacent to the elementary school. The organized sports which were available for boys through the recently formed community league included ice hockey, soccer

and baseball.

Before the final sample could be selected, it was first necessary to determine the natural breakdown of participant and non-participant eight- and nine-year old boys in this community. A preliminary information sheet was utilized for this purpose and can be found in Section I of Appendix C. This brief information sheet was explained to the children and then completed by all possible subjects. Upon completion of this initial inquiry, responses were checked against the community league register and a sample was selected. The assignment of a child to the participant or non-participant group was again verified during the child's interview and the parent's interview.

Over half (42) of the 73 eight- and nine-year old boys attending Brookside Elementary School were registered as participating in organized hockey during the year 1971-1972. Eleven boys did not elect to participate in hockey but did participate in some other organized sport. Twenty boys elected not to participate in organized sport. The overwhelming number of boys engaged in hockey led to the decision to limit the participant sample to hockey participants. The fact that one could easily verify whether or not a boy had registered for the hockey league also influenced this decision.

The 42 eight- and nine-year old hockey participants attending the school were divided into two groups, the 'signed veterans' and the 'signed rookies'. The 'signed veterans' consisted of 23 eight- and nine-year old boys registered for

hockey who had previous experience in organized sport. The 'signed rookies' numbering 19 were registered to participate in hockey as their initial exposure to organized sport. It was decided to select subjects for the participant interview sample from the group of experienced participants (signed veterans). With an average starting age of seven years old, these boys could be accurately classified as early participants in organized sport. In the final participant sample six subjects had begun participating at six years of age, six subjects at seven years of age and four subjects at eight years of age. Due to the fact that four non-participant subjects were deleted, the final sample size consisted of 16 non-participants and 16 participants. The final sample was comprised of seven grade three participants and seven grade three non-participants as well as nine grade four participants and nine grade four non-participants. The participants and non-participants were similar in age as well as grade. All subjects agreed to cooperate with the research project.

II. COLLECTION OF THE DATA

Both questionnaire and interview methods of gathering data were utilized in the study. The decision to include the interview technique for obtaining information was based on the expectation that the interview would allow for more in-depth study and lead to a greater understanding of the present problem. Good and Scates (1954), for example, feel

that in-depth interviewing attempts to get at the structure of motivation, or the dynamic structure of the individual. Wolf (1964) has also pointed out that the interview can provide the needed flexibility to elicit valid information and outlines several advantages of the interview as a data gathering technique: (1) the face to face nature of the interview allows the possibility of eliciting a high degree of cooperation on the part of the interviewee, (2) there is an opportunity to ask the interviewee additional questions when necessary, (3) the oral responses provide for a greater amount of detailed information, and (4) the information concerning the dynamic process of the environment is more readily obtained by this technique. To this end, then, interviews were conducted with each child and his mother, and questionnaires were administered to the child, his mother and his father.

After the initial sample was selected, an introductory letter was sent to the mother and father of each subject explaining the nature of the project as an investigation into what determines the leisure choices that children make. The parents were encouraged to cooperate with the project and were informed as to what would be expected in terms of time and type of information. The introductory letter was followed up with a telephone call wherein the researcher asked the mother if she would be willing to cooperate with the study. All families contacted agreed to assist with the research project. Each mother was informed that she would be contacted

in a few weeks (after the information was obtained from the boys) to make arrangements for an interview appointment. One researcher collected and analyzed all the data including the administration and scoring of all the interviews and questionnaires. A randomly selected number of child and parent tapes were later analyzed and scored by other raters to provide evidence that inter-rater reliability was attainable. An average inter-rater correlation coefficient of .93 confirmed the scoring reliability of the interview schedules.

The first phase of the data collection consisted of administering the complete battery of research instruments to the children. After consulting with their teachers it was decided that all questionnaire data would be read aloud to the grade three children and to selected grade four poor readers. All of the data was collected from the children before the hockey season began. An attempt was made to become somewhat known to the children during the ensuing time between the initial contact with the principal and the actual data collection by frequenting the premises and leading class discussions. It was felt that a good rapport with the children would help in eliciting valid responses, especially in the interview setting. Consequently, the researcher attempted to ensure that the subjects would feel at ease and feel free to express themselves rather than feeling threatened by some 'strange man'. In addition, the beginning of each interview was devoted to creating a relaxed, permissive atmosphere.

The first instrument to be administered to the subjects

was the Children's Personality Questionnaire (CPQ). Part A-1 was completed on one day followed by Part A-2 one or two days later. The second instrument administered was the Children's Interest Inventory (SRI). Part A, (Active Interests), and Part B, (Quiet Interests), were both completed during one session. The first two instruments (CPQ, SRI) were administered in a small group setting. The remaining instruments required an individual interview setting. A conference room was provided by the school principal. This provided an ideal interview environment with no distracting influences. This made it possible to interview approximately four or five boys per day depending on the teacher's schedule. All interviews were recorded on tape and subsequently analyzed and scored.

During the initial children's interview, two instruments were administered to each subject; the Children's Sports Environment Interview (CSE) and the Child's Attitude about Sports Inquiry. Upon completion of the CSE interview, the child's attitude about sport was attained through a verbal administration of the semantic differential. The final children's interview was administered after all the subjects had completed their initial interview. This interview was concerned with the child's self concept and his self perception of his sports ability. Following the Thomas procedure, a polaroid photograph was taken of each child in an attempt to help him gain objectivity about the self. The Thomas Self Concept Interview and the perception of sports ability inter-

view were then administered. At the conclusion of this session the child was given his photograph to keep and was thanked for his cooperation.

The second phase of the data collection consisted of administering the complete battery of research instruments to the parents. After obtaining all the necessary information from the children, a second telephone call was placed to each mother to make arrangements for an interview. All but two of the interviews were conducted in the home, the remaining two being carried out in the school conference room. The entire visit ranged from approximately 60 to 90 minutes during which all needed data was collected from the mother. Interviews were conducted during the day when the children were at school unless this was impossible for the mother. This generally provided the needed privacy and freedom from interruption, but also limited the number of interviews to two per day, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. During the first few minutes of the interview an attempt was made to create a permissive atmosphere within which the subjects felt free to express their feelings without fear of criticism or censorship. A brief introduction was also given at the beginning of each interview section (i.e., FSE, EAP, PAP, DFO). For example, with reference to the Early Activity Pattern Interview, the mother was told: "This next set of questions is concerned with Johnny's earlier years, you'll have to try to think back to answer these questions". The entire proceedings of the mother's interview were tape-recorded and, in most cases,

immediately analyzed and scored.

The Family Sports Environment interview which begins with questions that appear to be completely non-threatening was administered first. The next two interviews were concerned with the child's early activity patterns and present activity patterns. The purpose of the final interview was to investigate the home environment with respect to dependency fostering and overprotection. After all interview data was collected the questionnaires were administered in the following order: Early Activity Pattern Questionnaire, Present Activity Pattern Questionnaire, Mother's Attitude about Sports, and the General Information Questionnaire. Verbal instructions were given concerning the questionnaire rating procedure and any questions were answered. Most mothers talked through the questionnaire instruments aloud, verbalizing their thoughts and making frequent comments. After completing all the forms a mother often talked about her son or about her feelings toward sports. Any pertinent comments were noted immediately upon leaving the house.

A questionnaire concerned with attitudes about sports was left for the father to complete and return in a stamped, self-addressed envelope. The mother was thanked for her cooperation and told that a summary of the results would be mailed to her upon completion of the study.

III. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA¹

The analysis of the data consisted of determining (1) the significance of difference between the mean responses attained from participant and non-participant children, (2) the significance of difference between the mean responses obtained from the parents of participant and non-participant children, and (3) the correlations between selected variables.

The statistical analyses were produced by four programs:

1. An SPSS program to produce a CODEBOOK of mean, variance, standard deviation, absolute frequency, relative frequency (percent), mode, kurtosis, minimum score, standard error, skewness, maximum score, median, and range for all variables for each group.

2. A FORTRAN IV program (CS:227A) to compare the group on all variables by means of a t-test (Welch's t) and to determine the probability of any difference occurring by chance.

3. An SPSS program to correlate Child Sports Environment with Family Sports Environment for the entire sample, utilizing both Pearson correlation coefficients and Spearman correlation coefficients.

4. An SPSS program to provide a measure of rater reliability by means of both Pearson and Spearman correlation coefficients.

¹ A rationale for utilizing parametric versus non-parametric statistics can be found in Appendix D.

It was also planned to perform an item analysis on the newly created research instruments as a measure of internal consistency. However, due to the fact that a t-test for significance of difference between group means was conducted on each separate question, a traditional measure of internal consistency was deemed superfluous. It would already be known whether or not each question separated the groups and the extent to which each question separated the groups.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

The results in this chapter have been organized according to the test or instrument utilized for evaluation. The chapter is broadly divided into four sections; the first section dealing with the results of the children's instruments, the second with results from the parents' instruments, the third with the validity and reliability of the interview schedules, and the fourth section with actual excerpts from the interviews conducted with both children and parents.

I. RESULTS OF CHILDREN'S INSTRUMENTS

Child Sports Environment Interview - Quantified Data

The data showed significant differences between the responses of participant and non-participant children on the Child Sports Environment (CSE) Interview (Tables 1, 2, 3, 4). Participants and non-participants differed beyond the .001 level of significance on all six sections of the instrument as well as on the total CSE score. The significant section differences indicated that: (1) the primary sports involvement of participant children was greater than that of non-participant children, (2) the secondary sports involvement of participant children was greater than that of non-participant children, (3) participant children responded in a more positive manner to questions concerned with general sports information

TABLE 1

CHILD SPORTS ENVIRONMENT (PART A): MEANS, STANDARD
DEVIATIONS, WELCH'S T-TEST AND TWO SIDED PROBABILITY
FOR BOTH PARTICIPANT AND NON-PARTICIPANT
GROUPS (5 POINT SCALE)

Item	Participant		Non-Participant		Welch-T Test	Probability Two Tailed
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
PIC1A	4.56	0.62	1.37	0.88	14.40	0.0000***
1B	4.81	0.40	2.31	1.07	9.27	0.0000***
2A	5.00	0.00	1.18	0.40	37.83	0.0000***
3A	4.62	0.50	2.25	1.69	5.61	0.0000***
5	3.81	1.55	2.87	1.54	2.42	0.0281*
Total	22.81	2.10	10.00	3.79	13.50	0.0000***
SIC1A	4.12	0.71	1.62	1.20	8.30	0.0000***
2A	4.56	0.81	2.93	1.43	4.52	0.0004***
3A	4.18	1.60	2.68	1.77	3.37	0.0041**
Total	12.87	1.89	7.25	3.29	6.82	0.0000***
GSIC3	4.37	1.08	1.75	1.00	10.50	0.0000***
4A	4.81	0.54	3.56	1.67	2.99	0.0091**
5A	4.56	1.09	4.06	1.52	1.31	0.2097
9	4.06	1.18	2.25	0.85	8.46	0.0000***
Total	17.81	2.42	11.62	3.70	6.68	0.0000***

* P < .05; ** P < .01; *** P < .001.

Designations:

- PIC - Primary Sports Involvement of Child
 1A - Involvement in games or sports after school
 1B - Involvement in games or sports in summer
 2A - Plans for involvement on team (this year)
 3A - Experience on organized teams
 5 - Involvement of best friends in sports.
- SIC - Secondary Sports Involvement of Child
 1A - Attendance as spectator at live games
 2A - Viewing of sports on television
 3A - Allegiance to sports team.
- GSIC - General Sports Information - Child
 3 - Importance of sports to child
 4A - Likes to play sports
 5A - Likes to watch sports
 9 - Priority of sports.

TABLE 2

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION (PART A) (PERCENT) FOR
QUESTIONS COMPRISING CHILD SPORTS ENVIRONMENT
INTERVIEW FOR BOTH PARTICIPANT AND NON-PARTICIPANT
GROUPS (5 POINT RATING SCALE)

Group	Item	1	2	3	4	5
Part	PIC1A	0.0	0.0	6.2	31.3	62.5
NonP	1A	81.3	6.2	6.2	6.2	0.0
Part	1B	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.8	81.3
NonP	1B	25.0	37.5	18.8	18.8	0.0
Part	2A	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
NonP	2A	81.3	18.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Part	3A	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	62.5
NonP	3A	62.5	0.0	0.0	25.0	12.5
Part	5	12.5	12.5	12.5	6.2	56.3
NonP	5	31.3	6.2	25.0	18.8	18.8
Part	SIC1A	0.0	0.0	18.8	50.0	31.3
NonP	1A	75.0	0.0	18.8	0.0	6.2
Part	2A	0.0	6.2	0.0	25.0	68.8
NonP	2A	18.8	25.0	18.8	18.8	18.8
Part	3A	18.8	0.0	0.0	6.2	75.0
NonP	3A	37.5	25.0	0.0	6.2	31.3
Part	GSIC3	6.2	0.0	6.2	25.0	62.5
NonP	3	56.3	18.8	18.8	6.2	0.0
Part	4A	0.0	0.0	6.2	6.2	87.5
NonP	4A	18.8	12.5	12.5	6.2	50.0
Part	5A	6.2	0.0	6.2	6.2	81.2
NonP	5A	12.5	6.2	12.5	0.0	68.8
Part	9	0.0	12.5	25.0	6.2	56.3
NonP	9	25.0	25.0	50.0	0.0	0.0

Designations:

Groups: Part - Participants; NonP - Non-participants.

Items: Item designations are identical to those previously listed in Table 1.

TABLE 3

CHILD SPORTS ENVIRONMENT (PART B): MEANS, STANDARD
DEVIATIONS, WELCH'S T-TEST AND TWO SIDED PROBABILITY
FOR BOTH PARTICIPANT AND NON-PARTICIPANT
GROUPS (5 POINT SCALE)

Item	Participant		Non-Participant		Welch-T Test	Probability Two Tailed
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
CAA1A	4.56	1.03	3.00	1.59	3.92	0.0013***
2	4.56	0.81	4.06	0.77	2.59	0.0204*
3A	3.50	1.75	3.25	1.84	0.54	0.5955
4A	3.50	1.54	2.37	1.74	2.57	0.0210*
Total	16.12	3.73	12.68	2.65	5.18	0.0001***
CE1A	4.75	0.44	2.81	0.98	7.90	0.0000***
2	4.31	0.60	2.62	1.31	5.15	0.0001***
3A	3.25	1.77	4.12	1.36	-2.57	0.0212*
4A	4.56	1.09	4.25	1.29	0.96	0.3482
5	3.93	0.92	2.43	1.20	4.96	0.0001***
Total	20.81	2.94	16.25	3.71	4.91	0.0001***
CPPE1A	5.00	0.00	4.25	1.18	2.53	0.0228*
2A	3.12	1.99	2.43	1.82	1.50	0.1525
3	4.12	1.14	2.06	1.34	6.15	0.0000***
Total	12.25	2.46	8.75	3.29	4.24	0.0007***
CSETOT	102.68	8.36	66.56	13.51	10.89	0.0000***

* $P \leq .05$; ** $P \leq .01$; *** $P \leq .001$.

Designations:

- CAA - Child's Athletic Aspirations
 1A - Aspirations to be an athlete or member of team
 2 - Aspirations to be good at sports
 3A - Aspirations to be the star on a team
 4A - Aspirations to model reknowned athlete.
- CE - Child's Expectations from Participation
 1A - Expectations about making the team
 2 - Expectations about sports aptitude
 3A - Expectations about peer acceptance due to sports excellence
 4A - Expectations of pleasing parents by sports excellence
 5 - Perceived consequences of going out for team.
- CPPE - Child's Perception of Parental Expectations
 1A - Child's perception of parents wanting him to participate
 2A - Child's perception of significant others wanting him to participate
 3 - Child's perception of parents expecting him to participate.
- CSETOT - Child Sports Environment Total Score.

TABLE 4

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION (PART B) (PERCENT) FOR
QUESTIONS COMPRISING CHILD SPORTS ENVIRONMENT
INTERVIEW FOR BOTH PARTICIPANT AND NON-PARTICIPANT
GROUPS (5 POINT RATING SCALE)

Group	Item	1	2	3	4	5
Part	CAA1A	6.2	0.0	0.0	18.8	75.0
NonP	1A	31.3	6.2	12.5	31.3	18.8
Part	2	0.0	0.0	18.8	6.2	75.0
NonP	2	0.0	0.0	25.0	43.8	31.3
Part	3A	25.0	6.2	12.5	6.2	50.0
NonP	3A	37.5	0.0	0.0	25.0	37.5
Part	4A	18.8	0.0	37.5	0.0	43.8
NonP	4A	56.3	0.0	18.8	0.0	25.0
Part	CE1A	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0
NonP	1A	12.5	18.8	43.8	25.0	0.0
Part	2	0.0	0.0	6.2	56.3	37.5
NonP	2	31.3	6.2	37.5	18.8	6.2
Part	3A	25.0	18.8	6.2	6.2	43.8
NonP	3A	12.5	0.0	6.2	25.0	56.0
Part	4A	6.2	0.0	6.2	6.2	81.3
NonP	4A	6.2	6.2	12.5	6.2	68.8
Part	5	0.0	0.0	43.8	18.8	37.5
NonP	5	31.3	12.5	43.8	6.2	6.2
Part	CPPE1A	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
NonP	1A	6.2	0.0	18.8	12.5	62.5
Part	2A	43.8	0.0	6.2	0.0	50.0
NonP	2A	56.3	6.2	0.0	12.5	25.0
Part	3	6.2	0.0	18.8	25.0	50.0
NonP	3	56.3	6.2	12.5	25.0	0.0

Designations:

Groups: Part - Participants; NonP - Non-participants.

Items: Item designations are identical to those previously listed in Table 3.

(e.g., importance of sports) than did non-participant children, (4) participant children had higher athletic aspirations than did non-participant children, (5) participant children had more positive expectations from participation than did non-participant children, and (6) participant children had perceptions of parental expectations for participation which were greater than those of non-participant children.

For more detailed information, responses to the specific questions which made up each section of the CSE interview are outlined below.

Primary Sports Involvement of Child. Participant children played games and sports more often after school and in the summer, and had a greater amount of organized sports experience than non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). A greater number of participant children also had best friends who played sports when compared to non-participant children ($P \leq .05$).

Secondary Sports Involvement of Child. Participant children attended more live games and watched more sports on television than did non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). A greater number of participant children also had allegiance to sports teams when compared to non-participant children ($P \leq .01$).

General Sports Information. Participant children saw sports as being more important than did non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). Although a greater number of participant children indicated that they liked to play sports ($P \leq .01$), both participants and non-participants indicated that they

liked to watch sports. When asked about what they liked to do more than anything else, a greater number of participant children indicated that they liked to play sports ($P \leq .001$).

Child's Athletic Aspirations. More participant children indicated that they would like to be an athlete ($P \leq .001$) and to excel at sports ($P \leq .05$) than did non-participant children but there was no significant difference between the number of participant and non-participant children who would have liked to be a star on a team. A greater number of participants indicated that they would like to be a professional athlete ($P \leq .05$).

Child's Expectations from Participation. More participant children expected that they could make the team when compared to non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). Seventy-five percent of the participant children emphatically stated that they thought they could make the team this year, whereas, none of the non-participant children responded in this manner. Participant children were also of the opinion that they could be more proficient in sports than were non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). For example, 75 percent of the non-participants as opposed to 6.2 percent of the participants, felt that the best they could be at sports was average or below average. None of the participant children expressed a below average expectancy. A greater number of non-participants thought that the kids would like them better if they were really good at sports ($P \leq .05$) but there was no significant difference between participant and non-participant expectancies of making

parents happy by being really good at sports.

Participant children expected that going out for a team would be a more positive experience than did non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). It was found that 43.8 percent of the non-participants had definite negative expectancies from sports participation (e.g., "wouldn't like it", "wouldn't make it", "be scared", "wouldn't be any good") whereas none of the participants expressed these feelings. It was also found that 56.3 percent of the participant children had definite positive expectations from sports participation (e.g., "be fun", "be good", "be easy", "I'll be good") as opposed to 12.4 percent of the non-participant children.

Child's Perception of Parental Expectations. A greater number of participant children perceived their parents as definitely wanting them to take part in sports when compared to non-participant children ($P \leq .05$). However, no significant difference was found between participants and non-participants with reference to significant others, besides parents, wanting them to participate in sports. More participant children felt that either their mother or father expected them to be an athlete or expected them to participate in sports ($P \leq .001$). It was found that 62.5 percent of the non-participant children, as opposed to 6.2 percent of the participant children, did not feel that their parents expected them to participate in sports. Furthermore, 50 percent of the participants emphatically stated that they thought their parents expected them to participate in sports, whereas none of the non-participants

expressed this feeling.

Child Sports Environment Interview - Percentage Data

Responses which could not be weighted and scaled for statistical analysis are presented below.

Primary Sports Involvement of Child. The information obtained in this section of the interview verified that subjects classified as participants were going to play hockey this season and that subjects classified as non-participants had no plans of playing on any organized team this year. It also verified that all participants had previous experience in organized sport. The average starting age for participants was seven years old (range: age 6 to 8 years) with an average of one and one-half years of experience (range: 1 to 3 years).

The fact that all subjects were aware of organized teams being available for children was also verified. The children reported that they found out about these teams in the following manner:

<u>Participants</u>		<u>Non-Participants</u>	
<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Dad	43.8	School (announcement)	31.3
School (announcement)	37.5	Kids (friends)	31.3
Letter (community league)	18.8	Letter (community league)	12.5
		Don't know how	12.5
		Mom	6.2
		Dad	6.2

Secondary Sports Involvement of Child. Responses to questions in this section revealed that 68.8 percent of the

children who went to live sporting events went with their fathers, 25 percent went with both father and mother, and 6.2 percent went with their brother. Football was the sport most often attended, followed by hockey. For those children watching sports on television, hockey was most popular, followed by football. Children claiming allegiance to some sport team(s) most often mentioned professional hockey teams, followed by professional football teams.

General Sports Information. When the children were asked what their favorite hobby, sport, or activity was, they responded in the following manner:

<u>Participants</u>		<u>Non-Participants</u>	
<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Active sports	87.5	Quiet hobbies	56.3
Quiet activities	6.2	Quiet activities	18.8
Quiet hobbies	6.2	Playing with friends	12.5
		Active sports	6.2
		Don't have any	6.2

Designations:

Quiet hobbies - collecting things (rocks, planes), building things (models), drawing, model car racing, reading, studying, watching television.

Quiet activities - fishing, pool, ping pong, walking in woods.

Active sports - football, hockey, swimming, skiing.

The most popular activity for participants was hockey (43.8 percent) followed by football (31.3 percent), followed by skiing (6.2 percent) and swimming (6.2 percent).

The following responses were obtained when the children were asked about their father's favorite hobby, sport, or

activity:

<u>Participants</u>		<u>Non-Participants</u>	
<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Active sports	62.5	Quiet hobbies	37.5
Don't know	18.8	Don't know	31.3
Quiet hobbies	12.5	Quiet activities	12.5
Quiet activities	6.2	Doesn't have any	12.5
		Active sports	6.2

Designations:

Quiet hobbies - building things, painting, reading, television.

Quiet activities - fishing, hunting.

Active sports - skiing, football, hockey, golf.

The active sports most often mentioned were football (31.3 percent) followed by hockey (18.8 percent) followed by skiing (6.2 percent) and golf (6.2 percent).

In response to the question about their mother's favorite hobby, sport, or activity, the following comments were made:

<u>Participants</u>		<u>Non-Participants</u>	
<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Quiet hobbies	43.8	Don't know	43.8
Active sports	25.0	Quiet hobbies	18.8
Don't know	18.8	Active sports	12.5
Doesn't have any	6.2	Doesn't have any	12.5
Working	6.2	Working	12.5

Designations:

Quiet hobbies - painting, cooking, clubs, television, sewing, reading, art work.

Active sports - tennis, soccer, skating, curling, swimming.

The children were asked what they liked and what they didn't like about watching sports. Reasons given for liking

to watch sports fell into four major categories: excitement, vicarious winning, watching skilled performances, and learning.

A. Excitement:

Participants - like the action; they're exciting; like the jumps they take (motorcycles); fun to watch.

Non-Participants - there's lots of excitement and action; like to see 'em move; like to see tackles and body checks and passing; like the fighting.

B. Vicarious Winning:

Participants - you can root for your own team and really get excited; if you're cheering for a team, you want to see who wins.

Non-Participants - like it when my team scores a goal; you can see how many goals they make and when you're playing you don't actually always know; like to choose a team and see if it wins.

C. Watching Skilled Performances:

Participants - like to see how the professionals do it; like to see how good they can do it.

Non-Participants - you get to see professional players; like the way they make their plays.

D. Learning:

Participants - you can learn new things; you can get tips.

Non-Participants - you can see their movements and get ideas from them and then you can do the same thing.

E. Other:

Participants - you can tell what the scores are and the kids are always talking about sports; something to do.

Non-Participants - you don't have to drive all the way there and they give you close-ups and you can see better.

Reasons given for disliking to watch sports included:

Participants - don't like to watch too much; you want to be right there with them so I just go out and try it... I throw a ball around.

Non-Participants - it's too long; it just goes on and on and on; it gets too boring; commentators talk too much.

When the children were asked what they liked best about sports, the following responses were given:

<u>Participants</u>		<u>Non-Participants</u>	
<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Action	43.8	Watching	25.0
Fun	37.5	Exercise	18.8
Winning (scoring)	18.8	Fun	18.8
		Action	12.5
		Nothing	12.5
		Don't know	12.5

Designations:

Fun: Participants - fun... just like it; lots of fun for you and other kids too; it's fun; lots of fun... like everything.

Non-Participants - lots of fun in 'em; have fun.

Action: Participants - spring your energy; do something active; lots to do... don't get bored sitting around the house; like running around.

Non-Participants - the action, running around.

Winning: Participants - like to win; like when I'm good; scoring goals.

Watching: Non-Participants - like to watch; like the way they run around and tackle; action to watch.

When the children were asked what they liked least about sports, the following comments were made:

<u>Participants</u>		<u>Non-Participants</u>	
<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Negative experience	31.3	Boring	37.5
Failing	18.8	Failing	18.8
Getting hurt	18.8	Negative experience	12.5
Boring	12.5	Getting hurt	12.5
Like everything	12.5	Don't know	6.2
Cheating	6.2	Cheating	6.2
		Too much on T.V.	6.2

Designations:

Boring: Participants - I hate football 'cause it's so boring; as long as it's not too long... if it's just for about a half hour, I'll play.

Non-Participants - they always do the same thing again... it gets boring; in baseball you never get the ball... I get bored; in swimming once we did one thing we kept doing the same thing over and over again... and it got quite boring; I don't like just sitting around; it takes too long.

Failing: Participants - letting goals in... when I'm in net; when they take the puck from you; playing against a team with older kids.

Non-Participants - trying to make baskets in basketball and not being able to make them; never getting the puck; I don't like hockey 'cause I can't skate.

Negative experience: Participants - when kids push you around in a hockey game; when they check you; in football when they tackle you; getting all cold; practices and warm-ups.

Non-Participants - too much running; water going up my nose all the time in swimming; sometimes you get all tired out and you get a side ache and you still have to play.

Getting hurt: Participants - getting hurt or kicked; when players get hurt; getting cuts and scrapes.

Non-Participants - sometimes you get hurt; in some of the rough games like hockey, you could get hurt; you might get hurt when tackled; people get hurt... I just don't like it.

The children were asked what subject they liked best and least in school. Twenty-five percent of the participants and 12.5 percent of the non-participants liked gym best and none of the children listed gym as being their least liked subject.

The subjects were asked if there was anything they would like to see changed in sports to make them better or more fun. Their responses are outlined below:

<u>Participants</u> <u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Non-Participants</u> <u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Made suggestions	56.3	Made suggestions	62.5
Good now	31.3	Don't know how	31.3
Don't know how	12.5	Good now	6.2

Suggestions for improvements:

A. Scale Down Game:

Participants - In soccer use your hands and feet; in hockey learn to skate better; in baseball I'd make it four outs... four swings at the ball and four guys out before the other team comes up; not so much practice; I don't like tackle football 'cause it's kind of dangerous... I'd rather have flag; if it rains or snows change it to another time.

Non-Participants - In baseball, make the fields smaller, make the bases shorter, make the bats bigger; make it easy, not running too far, mostly kicking and not hitting, no batting; change baseball so you wouldn't have to stand out in the field all the time; cut down the time; make 'em not so rough, no hitting.

B. Rule Changes:

Participants - In hockey... if a guy got hurt and a guy did it on purpose, he'd get a longer penalty; in soccer you should wear a helmet and more padding... and the same for hockey and football.

Non-Participants - Change a couple of rules... like if somebody hurts somebody else, they might get sent off for a couple of minutes (e.g., football); in hockey they should have more penalty shots and cut down on putting a guy in the penalty box... except on real bad penalties like fighting; in soccer, if you score you should get more points like in football; do it backwards (other team gets points when you score).

C. General Changes:

Participants - In hockey, make better rinks, better lights and better boards; have better sticks and stronger nets... all the netting breaks and the sticks break all the time; fix the nets, they're all holely.

Non-Participants - Make everybody obey the rules... and just be honest; the players should be truthful in what they say (if he's out, he should say he's out); don't show them so often on T.V.; on T.V. if the commentators didn't talk so much, you could see what was going on.

Activities which both participants and non-participants said they would like to have in school or in the community are listed below (along with the percentage of each group mentioning the activity). Each subject could suggest as many activities as he wanted.

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Participant (%)</u>	<u>Non-Participant (%)</u>
Football	50.0	25.0
Hockey	43.8	18.8
Games in gym	31.3	6.2
Soccer	18.8	37.5
Swimming	12.5	12.5
Trips to ravine	12.5	6.2
Baseball	12.5	6.2
Building things (e.g., fort)	6.2	6.2
Small car racing	6.2	6.2
Basketball	6.2	6.2
Floor hockey	6.2	6.2

Other suggestions by participants included collecting things (e.g., rocks), skiing, skating, gymnastics, model aircraft, skits and individual projects. Other suggestions by non-participants included ping-pong, pool, tennis, hunting and fishing.

Child's Athletic Aspirations. Children gave the following reasons for wanting to be (or not wanting to be) an athlete or a member of a little league team:

Reasons for wanting to be:

Participants - 'Cause my dad's been playing football; I'd be able to have my sons learn to do stuff and grow up to be one; 'cause I think I'd qualify for it; just like it; to have sporting things and see what I'm like; it's fun, exercise; 'cause I like sports a lot; be fun and learn stuff; have a little fat and want to get slimmed down.

Non-Participants - might be fun; something to do if you have nothing to do and nothing is on T.V.; you could get away from doing other things you don't want to do; I like gym; like to be an athlete 'cause I hardly get a chance... I'm at the end of the line and strike out all the time; to do things that other people do; you get to play with others... like if you don't have any friends you might make friends right then.

Reasons for not wanting to be:

Participants - I'd rather be doing something else.

Non-Participants - Just waste time when you could do other good stuff; I'd rather be with my family than doing all sorts of athlete things; you might get a broken arm; I'm not interested in those things; I just don't like it; just don't think I would want to.

Participants and non-participants who expressed a desire to be good at sports gave the following reasons for wanting to be good:

<u>Participants</u>		<u>Non-Participants</u>	
<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
To score or win	40.0	To score or win	60.0
To make money	20.0	To be able to play	30.0
For fun	20.0	To be happier	10.0
Other	20.0		

Designations:

To score or win: Participants - 'Cause I like winning; so I can win all the teams; make more goals.

Non-Participants - So I could score and we would win; so I could make goals; so my team could win all the time; so I could make lots of scores.

To make money: Participants - To be a champ and make lots of money; so I'd get lots of money.

For fun: Participants - 'Cause you have fun; fun to play.

Other: Participants - Just want to be good; gives you a good feeling.

To be able to play: Non-Participants - So I could play sports and I wouldn't get fired or anything; so when I wanted to play, I could play; 'cause if you're not the coach won't think very much about you.

To be happier: Non-participants - You can get happy way more.

In response to the question "Why would you (or wouldn't you) want to be a star on a team", the following comments were made:

Reasons for wanting to be:

Participants - Because it's fun and people will cheer for you; everybody would like me more; 'cause you'd be looked up to; so I'd be known; everybody would cheer for you; they'd cheer and think you're not the rottenest guy on the team; then everybody could leave out my brother... 'cause he's always winning me; you'd be proud of what you're doing.

Non-Participants - You could have a lot of fun and play a lot; 'cause everybody likes you and wants you to be captain; 'cause stars got lots of nice things; go on T.V. a lot.

Reasons for not wanting to be:

Participants - I'd rather be a second star... I'd get too excited being star and wouldn't play properly; let somebody else have the chance... I'd have enough as I was; the kids kinda bug you... they push you around after that 'cause they think you're getting too tough; don't want to give everybody my autograph; well, you'd sorta be a show-off.

Non-Participants - People get jealous... it's hard on you to be a star... you gotta do a lot of stuff; 'cause you'd be spoiled; you get too many complaints from the players... they would complain to you 'cause somebody else did something wrong; just wouldn't; all the girls would be running around and kissing you.

When participants were asked if they thought they would always want to go out for a sports team, the following responses were obtained:

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	81.3
Not really	12.5
No	6.2

When non-participants were asked if they thought they would ever want to go out for a sports team they replied in the following manner:

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	18.8
Probably	12.5
Maybe	18.8
Not really	12.5
No	37.5

Child's Expectations from Participation. When non-participants were asked if they would go out for the team, if they thought they would surely make it, they responded as follows:

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	75.0
Guess so	6.2
Don't think so	6.2
No	12.5

In response to the question "What makes you think it would make your mother or father happy if you were really good at sports", the following comments were made:

Participants - 'Cause they like to see me play; they want me good at sports... they say they'd like me better at sports instead of just hanging around the house; 'cause they want me to be good at sports; well my dad was a good skater and he learned to do lots of stuff and he'd like me to be like that I guess; they'd be glad that I was real good at sports; my dad likes hockey and football... and he always gets us there on time and he wants us to go; they always say I'm indoors too much... watching too much T.V.; they like me to be good at things; my mother likes football and hockey; 'cause they want me to be good at things; my dad likes it when I win; my dad likes sports and would like me to be pretty good but I don't know about Mom; they would be proud of me; they'd be proud; my dad said he wants me to play sports 'cause he wants me to win lots of money so I could give it to him.

Non-Participants - 'Cause my dad told me he wants me to be good at sports; my dad always said you should be a football player when you grow up; 'cause they would be proud of me; he's (dad) kind of glad if we're good and get goals; they have said they'd like me to play sports; they would say you're very good at it.

Child's Perception of Parental Expectations. Participant children who indicated that someone besides their parents

wanted them to participate in sports mentioned the following people: grandfather (who played hockey), uncle (who plays hockey), brother, cousin, friend; and non-participants mentioned: sister, friend.

Thomas Self Concept Values Test

The results of the Thomas Self Concept Values Test indicated that there were no significant differences between participant and non-participant children in terms of total self concept (Table 5). Participant children were not significantly different from non-participant children with reference to how they perceived themselves or how they supposed that significant others (referents) perceived them (as measured by this instrument). Thirteen of the fourteen self value factors assessed did not reflect any significant differences between the groups. Participants and non-participants did not respond in a significantly different manner with reference to self perceptions about happiness, size, sociability, ability (academic), sharing, fearing things, fearing people, strength, cleanliness, health, attractiveness, material (desire for possessions) or independence.

The only significant difference between participant and non-participant children was concerned with the self value factor of male acceptance. Participant children tended to reject the male figure more often than non-participant children ($P \leq .05$). This was evidenced by their responses to the question, do you like to be with men or not like to be with men.

TABLE 5

THOMAS SELF CONCEPT VALUES TEST (STANDARD SCORES):
 MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, WELCH'S T-TEST, AND
 TWO SIDED PROBABILITY FOR BOTH PARTICIPANT
 AND NON-PARTICIPANT GROUPS

Item	Participant		Non-Participant		Welch-T Test	Probability Two Tailed
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
<u>Self Values</u>						
Happiness	49.12	5.46	50.12	6.82	-0.58	0.57
Size	45.18	11.79	46.25	11.76	-0.36	0.72
Sociability	52.31	8.45	46.62	11.33	2.00	0.06
Ability	51.12	6.65	48.50	8.90	1.17	0.26
Sharing	40.75	13.39	42.68	12.28	-0.63	0.54
Male Accept.	37.87	13.64	44.25	11.13	-2.29	0.04*
Fear Things	51.50	5.53	48.31	11.96	1.06	0.30
Fear People	53.00	5.02	53.87	5.72	-0.61	0.55
Strength	48.06	7.75	45.62	10.44	0.93	0.37
Cleanliness	35.00	25.52	38.68	20.84	-0.70	0.49
Health	52.87	10.65	48.68	9.73	1.72	0.11
Attractive	40.18	12.73	40.87	10.55	-0.26	0.80
Material	31.37	13.13	32.87	17.16	-0.34	0.73
Independence	40.00	13.03	36.25	15.33	0.97	0.34
<u>Referents</u>						
Self	48.18	6.63	48.50	7.16	-0.17	0.86
Mother	47.12	7.65	47.37	11.23	-0.08	0.93
Teacher	43.31	8.22	42.06	13.07	0.38	0.71
Peer	44.18	8.18	43.50	11.05	0.24	0.81
<u>Total Self Concept</u>	44.93	8.32	44.43	11.87	0.16	0.87

* $P \leq .05$

Self Perception of Sports Ability

The data (Table 6) indicates that participant children had more positive self perceptions of sports ability than did non-participant children ($P \leq .05$). This finding was supported by the significant difference previously reported concerning participant and non-participant expectations of sports aptitude (CSE Ques. CE 2).

TABLE 6

SELF PERCEPTION OF SPORTS ABILITY: MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, WELCH'S T-TEST AND TWO SIDED PROBABILITY FOR BOTH PARTICIPANT AND NON-PARTICIPANT GROUPS

<u>Participant</u>		<u>Non-Participant</u>		Welch's T- Test	Probability Two Tailed
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
2.62	1.82	0.93	2.62	2.57	0.021*

* $P \leq .05$.

Maximum possible raw score range: -4 to +4.

Note: A frequency distribution for the data presented in this table can be found in Section I of Appendix E.

Children's Attitude about Sports

The attitudinal data (Table 7) indicates that participant children had a more positive attitude toward sports than did non-participant children ($P \leq .05$). They rated sports as being more good than bad ($P \leq .05$), more worthwhile ($P \leq .01$), and nicer ($P \leq .05$) than did non-participant children. None of the

TABLE 7

CHILDREN'S ATTITUDE ABOUT SPORT: MEANS, STANDARD
DEVIATIONS, WELCH'S T-TEST AND TWO SIDED PROBABILITY
FOR BOTH PARTICIPANT AND NON-PARTICIPANT
GROUPS (7 POINT SCALE)

Item	Participant		Non-Participant		Welch T Test	Probability Two Tailed
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
1	5.56	1.45	4.75	1.39	2.33	0.0336*
2	6.25	0.85	4.81	1.51	3.79	0.0017**
3	5.81	1.22	5.12	1.36	2.02	0.0614
4	4.43	1.41	4.43	1.03	0.00	1.0000
5	6.25	1.18	5.37	1.31	2.67	0.0174*
6	5.81	1.32	5.50	1.26	0.98	0.3387
7	4.31	1.85	4.18	1.22	0.40	0.6884
8	2.75	1.77	3.12	1.18	-1.37	0.1881
Total Score	41.18	6.21	37.31	6.05	2.56	0.0217*

* $P \leq .05$; ** $P \leq .01$

Designations:

Item	High Score		Low Score
1	Good	vs	Bad
2	Worthwhile	vs	Worthless
3	Pleasant	vs	Unpleasant
4	Sweet	vs	Sour
5	Nice	vs	Awful
6	Happy	vs	Sad
7	Clean	vs	Dirty
8	Relaxed	vs	Tense

Note: A frequency distribution for the data presented in this table can be found in Section II of Appendix E.

other attitudinal designations (pleasant vs. unpleasant, sweet vs. sour, happy vs. sad, clean vs. dirty, relaxed vs. tense) differentiated between groups. It was interesting to note that none of the non-participants and only 12.4 percent of the participants saw sports as being relaxed.

SRA Children's Interest Inventory

The quantified data concerned with the children's active and quiet play interests indicates that there was no significant difference between the total number of active interests expressed by participant and non-participant children (Table 8). However, non-participant children did have a greater number of quiet interests than participant children ($P \leq .05$).

TABLE 8

SRA INTEREST INVENTORY: MEANS, STANDARD
DEVIATIONS, WELCH'S T-TEST AND TWO SIDED
PROBABILITY FOR BOTH PARTICIPANT AND
NON-PARTICIPANT GROUPS

Item	Participant		Non-Participant		Welch T Test	Probability Two Tailed
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Active Interests	23.12	8.04	23.00	5.30	0.09	0.926
Quiet Interests	14.50	6.96	17.25	4.90	-2.24	0.040*

* $P \leq .05$.

Maximum possible scores: Active Play Interest - 40

Quiet Play Interest - 33

Note: Frequency distributions for all SRA active and quiet interests can be found in Sections III and IV of Appendix E.

Frequency distributions for the items comprising active and quiet play interests indicated that the top ten SRA active interests for participant and non-participant children were:

<u>Participants</u>		<u>Non-Participants</u>	
<u>Activity</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1. Swimming	100.0	1. Climb trees	100.0
2. Shoot targets with bow & arrow, bb gun	100.0	2. Camping	93.8
3. Hockey	93.8	3. Explore caves	93.8
4. Football	93.8	4. Go sledding in snow	93.8
5. Camping	93.8	5. Shoot targets with bow & arrow, bb gun	87.5
6. Explore caves	81.3	6. Build things with snow	81.3
7. Ride horseback	81.3	7. Ride horseback	81.3
8. Fishing	81.3	8. Go on hikes	81.3
9. Throw rocks or darts at target	75.0	9. Fly a kite	81.3
10. Kickball, dodgeball	75.0	10. Swimming	81.3

None of the top ten choices of the non-participant children appeared to be of a competitive nature in terms of man being pitted against man or team versus team. Several of the top choices expressed by participant children had a team game or competitive orientation.

The top ten SRA quiet interests for participant and non-participant children were as follows:

<u>Participants</u>		<u>Non-Participants</u>	
<u>Activity</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1. Go to movies	93.8	1. Go to movies	93.8
2. Play table games like monopoly	75.0	2. Play with a yo-yo	93.8
3. Belong to a club	75.0	3. Build things with an erector set	87.3
4. Build things with an erector set	75.0	4. Take care of pet	87.5
5. Play with a yo-yo	68.8	5. Play table games like monopoly	87.5
6. Play checkers	62.5	6. Visit parents' friends	81.3
7. Take care of pet	62.5	7. Play checkers	68.8
8. Collect things like pictures, stamps	56.3	8. Belong to a club	68.8
9. Play cards by self	56.3	9. Play card games	68.8
10. Play with model train	56.3	10. Play with model train	68.8

There were only 5 quiet activities that 68.8 percent (or more) of the participant children indicated they would like to do whereas there were 10 such activities in which 68.8 percent (or more) of the non-participant children expressed an interest.

Children's Personality Questionnaire

The personality data indicates that participant and non-participant children differed significantly on the primary factors E, F, H, I and on the second order factor Extraversion versus Introversion (Table 9). Participant children tended to be more dominant ($P \leq .05$), more happy-go-lucky ($P \leq .01$), more venturesome ($P \leq .05$), more toughminded ($P \leq .01$), and more extraverted ($P \leq .05$), than non-participant children.

TABLE 9

CHILDREN'S PERSONALITY QUESTIONNAIRE: MEANS,
STANDARD DEVIATIONS, WELCH'S T-TEST AND
PROBABILITY FOR BOTH PARTICIPANT AND
NON-PARTICIPANT GROUPS

Factor	Participant		Non-Participant		Welch T Test	Probability Two Tailed
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
A	5.93	1.87	6.06	2.14	-0.23	0.818
B	6.62	1.99	6.68	1.53	-0.16	0.872
C	5.43	1.67	5.75	1.94	-0.64	0.531
D	5.06	2.01	4.87	2.44	0.30	0.763
E	6.68	1.81	5.50	2.28	2.08	0.054*
F	7.18	1.75	5.68	2.12	2.83	0.012**
G	5.75	2.04	5.25	2.59	0.77	0.452
H	5.87	2.24	4.62	2.21	2.25	0.039*
I	2.06	1.84	3.31	1.85	-2.75	0.014**
J	3.81	1.47	4.06	1.87	-0.53	0.602
N	5.06	1.91	4.06	2.01	1.98	0.065
O	3.18	1.87	3.43	2.25	-0.44	0.663
Q3	5.25	2.51	5.31	2.08	-0.12	0.906
Q4	5.25	2.35	4.81	2.00	0.87	0.397
Ex	19.00	3.67	16.37	4.87	2.15	0.047*

* $P \leq .05$; ** $P \leq .01$.

Designations:

Factor	High Score		Low Score
A	Easy Going	vs	Reserved
B	More Intelligent	vs	Less Intelligent
C	Emotionally Mature	vs	Emotionally Unstable
D	Excitable	vs	Phlegmatic
*E	Dominant	vs	Submissive
**F	Happy-Go-Lucky	vs	Serious
G	Persevering	vs	Frivolous
*H	Venturesome	vs	Shy
**I	Tenderminded	vs	Toughminded
J	Internally Restrained	vs	Vigorous
N	Shrewd	vs	Simple
O	Self Reproaching	vs	Complacent
Q3	Self Controlled	vs	Lax
Q4	Tense	vs	Relaxed
*Ex	Extraverted	vs	Introverted

II. RESULTS OF PARENTS' INSTRUMENTS

Family Sports Environment Interview - Quantified Data

The data showed significant differences between the responses of participants' and non-participants' mothers on the FSE interview (Tables 10, 11, 12, 13). Mothers of participant and non-participant children differed beyond the .001 level of significance on all four sections of the instrument, as well as on the total FSE score, which indicated that there were distinct differences between the family sports environments of participant and non-participant children. The significant differences found on each section of the instrument indicated that: (1) the primary sports involvement of families with children who elected to participate in sport was greater than that of families with children who did not elect to participate, (2) the secondary sports involvement of families with children who elected to participate in sport was greater than that of families with children who did not elect to participate in sport. (3) parental expectations and aspirations concerning the child's sports participation were higher for parents with children who elected to participate in sports than for parents with children who did not elect to participate, and (4) parents with children who participated in sports encouraged their children to participate more than did parents with non-participant children. Furthermore the total score correlation between the children's responses on the CSE interview and their mother's responses on the FSE interview was 0.86 ($P \leq .001$).

TABLE 10

FAMILY SPORTS ENVIRONMENT (PART A): MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, WELCH'S T-TEST AND TWO SIDED PROBABILITY FOR BOTH PARTICIPANT AND NON-PARTICIPANT GROUPS (5 POINT SCALE)

Item	Participant		Non-Participant		Welch T Test	Probability Two Tailed
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
PIF1A	4.50	0.51	2.43	1.36	6.04	0.0000***
2A	4.25	0.85	2.56	1.03	6.54	0.0000***
2B	4.12	0.80	2.62	1.02	5.85	0.0000***
3	4.56	0.62	2.50	1.26	6.52	0.0000***
4	3.93	0.99	2.50	0.63	9.09	0.0000***
5	3.81	1.42	2.31	1.49	4.01	0.0011***
Total	25.18	3.48	14.93	5.26	7.79	0.0000***
SIF1	4.68	0.60	1.75	1.06	11.03	0.0000***
2	4.81	0.54	2.81	1.37	5.81	0.0000***
3A	4.56	0.96	2.62	1.54	5.02	0.0001***
3B	2.87	1.96	1.12	0.34	20.49	0.0000***
4A	4.37	0.95	1.37	0.88	13.55	0.0000***
4B	4.12	1.08	1.81	1.10	8.34	0.0000***
5	4.56	1.03	2.43	1.71	4.96	0.0001***
Total	30.00	5.26	13.93	6.52	9.84	0.0000***

* $P \leq .05$; ** $P \leq .01$; *** $P \leq .001$.

Designations:

PIF - Primary Sports Involvement of Family
 1A - Parents prior involvement in sports
 2A - Parents present involvement in sports (in summer)
 2B - Parents present involvement in sports (in winter)
 3 - Other siblings involvement in sports
 4 - Involvement in physical activity as a family
 5 - Membership at sports club.

SIF - Secondary Sports Involvement of Family
 1 - Attendance at athletic events as spectators
 2 - Viewing of sports on television
 3A - Father reading about sports in newspaper
 3B - Father turning directly to sports section
 4A - Magazines or books on sports in home
 4B - Parents reading about sports in magazines
 5 - Allegiance to sports teams.

TABLE 11

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION (PART A) (PERCENT) FOR
QUESTIONS COMPRISING FAMILY SPORTS ENVIRONMENT
INTERVIEW FOR BOTH PARTICIPANT AND
NON-PARTICIPANT GROUPS (5 POINT RATING SCALE)

Group	Item	1	2	3	4	5
Part	PIF1A	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
NonP	1A	37.5	12.5	25.0	18.8	6.2
Part	2A	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0
NonP	2A	12.5	37.5	37.5	6.2	6.2
Part	2B	0.0	0.0	25.0	37.5	37.5
NonP	2B	12.5	31.3	43.8	6.2	6.2
Part	3	0.0	0.0	6.2	31.3	62.5
NonP	3	37.5	0.0	37.5	25.0	0.0
Part	4	0.0	6.2	31.3	25.0	37.5
NonP	4	0.0	56.3	37.5	6.2	0.0
Part	5	12.5	0.0	31.3	6.2	50.0
NonP	5	50.0	0.0	31.3	6.2	12.5
Part	SIF1	0.0	0.0	6.2	18.8	75.0
NonP	1	56.3	25.0	6.2	12.5	0.0
Part	2	0.0	0.0	6.2	6.2	87.5
NonP	2	25.0	18.8	12.5	37.5	6.2
Part	3A	0.0	6.2	12.5	0.0	81.3
NonP	3A	37.5	12.5	12.5	25.0	12.5
Part	3B	43.8	12.5	0.0	0.0	43.8
NonP	3B	87.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Part	4A	0.0	6.2	12.5	18.8	62.5
NonP	4A	81.3	6.2	6.2	6.2	0.0
Part	4B	0.0	12.5	12.5	25.0	50.0
NonP	4B	62.5	0.0	31.3	6.2	0.0
Part	5	0.0	12.5	0.0	6.2	81.3
NonP	5	50.0	12.5	0.0	18.8	18.8

Designations:

Groups: Part - Participants; NonP - Non-Participants.

Items: Item designations are identical to those previously listed on Table 10.

TABLE 12

FAMILY SPORTS ENVIRONMENT (PART B): MEANS, STANDARD
DEVIATIONS, WELCH'S T-TEST AND TWO SIDED PROBABILITY
FOR BOTH PARTICIPANT AND NON-PARTICIPANT
GROUPS (5 POINT SCALE)

Item	Participant		Non-Participant		Welch T Test	Probability Two Tailed
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
EA1	4.31	1.19	2.43	1.20	6.20	0.0000***
2A	4.75	0.57	3.68	1.25	3.40	0.0038**
3	2.37	0.71	1.93	0.44	3.95	0.0012***
4	2.93	1.18	2.31	0.70	3.55	0.0029**
5	4.56	0.51	1.56	0.89	13.45	0.0000***
Total	18.93	2.97	11.93	3.29	8.49	0.0000***
EN1A	4.37	1.02	2.25	1.23	6.86	0.0000***
2A	2.37	1.70	1.75	1.29	1.93	0.0718
3	3.43	1.20	1.62	1.02	7.07	0.0000***
4	3.75	0.93	2.12	0.80	8.06	0.0000***
5A	3.68	0.94	1.68	0.47	16.71	0.0000***
5B	4.81	0.40	3.25	0.77	8.06	0.0000***
6	4.68	0.70	2.56	0.51	16.59	0.0000***
7	4.87	0.34	2.68	0.79	11.03	0.0000***
Total	32.00	3.38	17.93	3.83	14.65	0.0000***
FSETOT	106.12	10.91	58.75	16.11	11.76	0.0000***

* $P \leq .05$; ** $P \leq .01$; *** $P \leq .001$.

Designations:

- EA - Parental Expectations and Athletic Aspirations for Child
- 1 - Expectations of boy participating
 - 2A - Desire for son to participate
 - 3 - Expectations of boys proficiency level in sports
 - 4 - Parents athletic aspirations for boy
 - 5 - Involvement of son in sports training program.
- EN - Encouragement for Participation
- 1A - Parents encouragement for boys participation
 - 2A - Significant others encouragement for boys participation
 - 3 - Mothers encouragement for active versus quiet play
 - 4 - Fathers participation in sports activities with son
 - 5A - Sports gifts given to boy
 - 5B - Sports equipment owned by boy
 - 6 - Parents viewing boy play or practice
 - 7 - Parents discussing sports with boy

FSETOT - Family Sports Environment Total Score

TABLE 13
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION (PART B) (PERCENT) FOR
 QUESTIONS COMPRISING FAMILY SPORTS ENVIRONMENT
 INTERVIEW FOR BOTH PARTICIPANT AND
 NON-PARTICIPANT GROUPS (5 POINT RATING SCALE)

Group	Item	1	2	3	4	5
Part	EA1	0.0	18.8	0.0	12.5	68.8
NonP	1	25.0	31.3	25.0	12.5	6.2
Part	2A	0.0	0.0	6.2	12.5	81.3
NonP	2A	12.5	6.2	0.0	62.5	18.8
Part	3	0.0	75.0	12.5	12.5	0.0
NonP	3	12.5	81.3	6.2	0.0	0.0
Part	4	0.0	50.0	25.0	6.2	18.8
NonP	4	0.0	81.3	6.2	12.5	0.0
Part	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	43.8	56.3
NonP	5	68.8	6.2	25.0	0.0	0.0
Part	EN1A	6.2	0.0	0.0	37.5	56.3
NonP	1A	37.5	25.0	12.5	25.0	0.0
Part	2A	56.3	0.0	12.5	12.5	18.8
NonP	2A	68.8	6.2	12.5	6.2	6.2
Part	3	6.2	6.2	56.3	0.0	31.3
NonP	3	68.8	6.2	18.8	6.2	0.0
Part	4	0.0	0.0	56.3	12.5	31.3
NonP	4	25.0	37.5	37.5	0.0	0.0
Part	5A	0.0	18.8	6.2	62.5	12.5
NonP	5A	31.3	68.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Part	5B	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.8	81.3
NonP	5B	0.0	18.8	37.5	43.8	0.0
Part	6	0.0	0.0	12.5	6.2	81.3
NonP	6	0.0	43.8	56.3	0.0	0.0
Part	7	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	87.5
NonP	7	6.2	31.3	50.0	12.5	0.0

Designations:

Groups: Part - Participant; NonP - Non-Participant.

Items: Item designations are identical to those previously listed on Table 12.

For more detailed information, responses to the specific questions which made up each section of the FSE interview are outlined below.

Primary Sports Involvement of Family. There was a difference between the competitive sport backgrounds of parents of participant and non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). All participant children had at least one parent who had been an athlete or a member of a competitive sports team, whereas 75 percent of the non-participant children had parents who had never been members of competitive sports teams. Participants' parents took part in sports or physical activities more often than non-participants' parents, both in the summer and winter ($P \leq .001$). Seventy-five percent of the participant children had at least one parent who was currently taking part in some physical activity twice a week or more, whereas only 12.5 percent of the non-participant children had parents in this category.

There was more sibling sports participation in the families of participant children than in the families of non-participant children ($P \leq .001$), as was shown by 62.5 percent of the participant children having brothers and sisters all extensively involved in several sports and another 31.3 percent having siblings involved on some sports team or training in some activity on a regular basis. Conversely, 75 percent of the non-participant children did not have any siblings who were involved in sports to the extent of being on a sports team. Families of participant children got together, as a

family, to partake in more physical activities than did families of non-participant children ($P \leq .001$), and a greater number of families with participant children belonged to sports clubs or recreation centers ($P \leq .001$).

Secondary Sports Involvement of Family. Parents of participant children attended live athletic events more often than parents of non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). Whereas 93.8 percent of the participant children had parents who had attended at least five live games in the last year (e.g., professional or university), 81.3 percent of the non-participant children had parents who had either not attended any live games or attended only one in the same time period. Parents of participant children also watched sports on television more often than parents of non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). This is shown by the fact that 87.5 percent of the participants' parents watched sports on television at least three times a week, as opposed to 6.2 percent of the non-participants' parents. An additional finding showed that although 43.8 percent of the non-participant children had parents who either did not watch sports on television or watched it less than once a month, no participant children had parents in this category.

Fathers of participant children read about sports in the newspaper more often than fathers of non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). For example, 81.3 percent of the participants' fathers, as opposed to 12.5 percent of the non-participants' fathers, read about sports in the newspaper

every day. Fathers of participant children also turned directly to the sports section more often than fathers of non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). Participant children had more sports reading material (e.g., magazines, books) available in their homes when compared to non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). While 81.3 percent of the participant children had at least two or three sports magazines or books in the home, 81.3 percent of the non-participant children had no sports literature in the home. Parents of participant children read about sports in magazines or books more often than parents of non-participants ($P < .001$), and a greater number of participants' parents had allegiance to sports teams ($P \leq .001$). With reference to the latter point, 81.3 percent of the participant children as opposed to 18.8 percent of the non-participant children had parent(s) who followed and rooted for definite teams.

Parental Expectations and Athletic Aspirations for Child. A greater number of participant children had parents who expected them to participate in sports when compared to the parents of non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). It was found that 68.8 percent of the participants' parents had definite expectations of their children participating in sports whereas only 6.2 percent of the non-participants' parents fell under this category. More participant children had parents who said they would like them to participate in sports when compared to parents of non-participant children ($P \leq .01$). In fact, 81.3 percent of the participants' parents,

as opposed to 18.8 percent of the non-participants' parents, expressed a very definite desire to have their child participate in sports.

Participants' parents had higher expectations concerning the level that their child may attain in sports ($P \leq .001$) and indicated that they would like him to be better at sports (if given a choice), when compared to parents of non-participants. It is interesting to note that 81.3 percent of the non-participants' mothers and 50 percent of the participants' mothers expressed no aspirations concerning the child's level of athletic proficiency and indicated that the important thing was just to enjoy it. Participant children were enrolled in more physical activities outside the school than were non-participant children ($P \leq .001$), with all participant children and no non-participant children involved in some such activity at least twice a week.

Encouragement for Participation. A greater number of participant children had parents who had encouraged them to participate in sports when compared to parents of non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). Whereas 93.8 percent of the participants' parents reported having encouraged their son to participate in sports, 75 percent of the non-participants' parents indicated that they did not encourage their son to get involved in sports. Neither the participant nor non-participant group was reported to have had a significant amount of encouragement from anyone other than the parents. Mothers of participant children reported that over the years

they had encouraged active play as opposed to quiet play more often than mothers of non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). Only 6.2 percent of the participants' mothers, as opposed to 68.8 percent of the non-participants' mothers, indicated that they had encouraged quiet play over active play.

Fathers of participant children took part in some sport related activity with their son more often than did fathers of non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). For example, 62.5 percent of the non-participants' fathers either seldom or never did any sports related activity with their son, whereas no participants' fathers were reported to fall under this category. Furthermore, 43.8 percent of the fathers of participant children participated in sport related activities with their son as often as three times a week.

Participant children owned a greater amount of sports equipment ($P \leq .001$), and received more sports gifts for birthdays and Christmases than did non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). None of the non-participant children were reported to have received more than one or two sports items as gifts in the last two or three years, whereas 75 percent of the participant children were reported to have received at least five or six sports items as gifts in the same time period.

Parents of participant children watched their son play or practice sport related activities more often than did parents of non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). While 87.5 percent of the participant children had parents who watched

them at least once or twice a week, no non-participant children had parents in this category. Parents of participant children also had discussions with their son concerning sports more often than did parents of non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). Whereas 87.5 percent of the participant children had discussions with their parent(s) about sports at least once a week, none of the non-participant children discussed sports with their parents this often.

Family Sports Environment Interview - Percentage Data

Responses which could not be weighted and scaled for statistical analysis were included in this section.

Parental Expectancies and Athletic Aspirations for Child.

When the mothers were asked why they would or would not like their child to participate in sports, the mothers of non-participant children gave the following reasons for not wanting their child to participate: I don't like organized sports (6.2 percent); They go overboard (6.2 percent).

Mothers of participant and non-participant children gave the following reasons for wanting their child to participate in sports:

Participants

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Learn how to cooperate	37.5
Very good for them	31.3
Physical and mental development	25.0
Keep them active	18.8
Keep them out of mischief	18.8
Work off energy	18.8
Out with other kids	18.8
Be a better person	12.5
Become more competitive	12.5
Physical development	12.5
Exercise	12.5
Learn to lose	12.5
For pleasure	12.5
Team spirit	6.2
Health	6.2
To be on their own	6.2

Non-Participants

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
For pleasure	18.8
Teaches team spirit and sportsmanship	18.8
To develop physically	18.8
Exercise	18.8
Good, wholesome activity	12.5
Keep him out of mischief	12.5
Get rid of energy	12.5
To be involved in a group	12.5
Competition good to experience	12.5
Teaches cooperation	6.2
Teaches responsibility	6.2
To succeed at something	6.2
Get him out of doors	6.2
Interest for when older	6.2
Health	6.2
Get to know people	6.2

Encouragement for Participation. Those mothers who stated that they (parents) had encouraged their son to participate in sports, indicated that they used the following means of encouragement:

<u>Participants</u>		<u>Non-Participants</u>	
<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Take them with us	43.8	Enrolling him	12.5
Own Interest	37.5	Gave him the choice	6.2
By example	31.5	Buy him equipment	6.2
Bought them equipment	18.8	By our attitude	6.2
Push them out there	12.5	Drive him	6.2
Joining them	12.5		
Ask if they want to	6.2		

Seventy-five percent of the participants' parents indicated that they encouraged their children to participate either by example, by being interested in sports themselves, or by taking the children along, whereas only 6.2 percent of the non-participants' parents were in this category.

Parents of participant children who indicated that someone else (besides themselves) may have encouraged their son to participate in sports mentioned the following people: my father (who was very active), his uncle (who plays hockey), older brothers, my family, friends; and non-participants' parents mentioned: university player, brother.

General Sports Information. When asked what was personally attractive to them about sports (if anything), the mothers responded with the following comments.

<u>Participants</u>		<u>Non-Participants</u>	
<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Keep fit	31.3	Like outdoors (fresh air, walking)	37.5
Enjoy it	31.3	Keep fit	37.5
Excitement	25.0	Enjoyment	25.0
Feel better	25.0	Work as a team	18.8
Like the activity	25.0	Don't like sports	18.8
Challenge	12.5	Being with people	12.5
Outdoors	6.2	Energy outlet	12.5
Keep alert	6.2	Develop skills	6.2
Therapy	6.2	Exciting	6.2
Something I can do	6.2		

When the mothers were asked if there was anything they disliked about organized sports for children, they responded in the following manner:

<u>Participants</u>		<u>Non-Participants</u>	
<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Too much emphasis on winning	68.8	Too much emphasis on winning	62.5
Too competitive	37.5	Too much pressure	31.3
Not letting all kids play equally	37.5	Too competitive	25.0
Too much pressure	25.0	Not letting all kids play equally	25.0
Too organized	12.5	Too organized	18.8
Too serious	12.5	Too dangerous	18.8

Mothers of both participant children (87.5 percent) and non-participant children (75 percent) expressed a dislike for the winning emphasis, the pressure, the competitiveness or some combination thereof.

When participants' mothers were asked if they would prefer their son to be outstanding in one sport or average in many, 75 percent stated a preference for average in many while 25 percent favored outstanding in one.

When asked about what type of activities or facilities they would like to have available in the community, the mothers responded in the following manner:

<u>Participants</u>		<u>Non-Participants</u>	
<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Swimming pool	62.5	Swimming pool	37.5
Indoor arena	50.0	Tennis courts	37.5
More for girls	25.0	Indoor arena	12.5
Tennis courts	18.8	More for girls	12.5
		Space for kids to play	12.5
		Separate skating rink	12.5
		Arts and crafts	12.5

Other suggestions from participants included flag football, lacrosse, grass hockey, basketball, skiing and hockey in school, music, golf, gymnastics, dancing, skating rink, indoor soccer arena. Further suggestions from non-participants included music, creative dance, needlework, folk dance, model club, rowing, canoeing, free rink time, games, football.

Each mother was asked if there was anything she would like to see changed in sports to make them better, or to make it a better experience for the children. The mothers responded with the following suggestions.

<u>Participants</u>		<u>Non-Participants</u>	
<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Equal opportunities for all	62.5	Emphasize fun (enjoyment)	62.5
Emphasize fun (enjoyment)	43.8	Less winning stress	18.8
Emphasize good sportsmanship	12.5	Less competitiveness	18.8
Less organization so early	6.2	Less pressure	12.5
		Equal opportunity for all	12.5
		Prevent injuries	6.2

Dependency Fostering-Overprotective Home Environment

The data indicates that there were significant differences between the home environments of participant and non-participant children, with respect to dependency fostering and overprotection in upbringing (Table 14). Participant children came from less dependency fostering-overprotective home environments than did non-participant children ($P \leq .01$).

TABLE 14

DEPENDENCY FOSTERING-OVERPROTECTIVE HOME ENVIRONMENT: MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, WELCH'S T-TEST AND TWO SIDED PROBABILITY FOR BOTH PARTICIPANT AND NON-PARTICIPANT GROUPS

<u>Participant</u>		<u>Non-Participant</u>		Welch's T-Test	Probability Two Tailed
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
28.29	6.18	33.81	7.30	-3.02	0.008**

** $P \leq .01$.

Scale: High score indicates a dependency fostering-overprotective home environment.

Maximum possible score range: 8-56.

Early Activity Patterns of Child

The data indicates that there were significant differences between the early activity patterns of participant and non-participant children (Table 15). The Early Activity Pattern (EAP) total scores were higher for participant than for non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). Individual items

TABLE 15

EARLY ACTIVITY PATTERNS OF CHILD: MEAN,
STANDARD DEVIATIONS, WELCH'S T-TEST AND TWO
SIDED PROBABILITY FOR BOTH PARTICIPANT AND
NON-PARTICIPANT GROUPS (5 POINT SCALE)

Item	Participant		Non-Participant		Welch's T-Test	Probability Two Tailed
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
EAPQ1	3.43	0.96	2.68	0.94	3.17	0.0063**
2	4.18	0.83	3.93	1.06	0.94	0.8192
3	4.06	1.24	3.37	1.08	2.52	0.0231*
4	4.25	1.18	3.75	1.12	1.77	0.0958
5	3.62	0.80	3.68	0.79	-0.31	0.7569
6	4.06	1.12	3.06	0.85	4.68	0.0002***
EAPI1	3.93	1.34	3.06	1.48	2.36	0.0321*
2	4.00	1.50	3.37	1.50	1.66	0.1163
3	4.25	0.85	2.37	1.20	6.22	0.0000***
EAPTOT	35.81	6.52	29.31	5.95	4.36	0.0005***

* $P \leq .05$; ** $P \leq .01$; *** $P \leq .001$.

Designations:

EAPQ - Early Activity Pattern Questionnaire

EAPQ

<u>Item</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>High Score</u>		<u>Low Score</u>
1	2 mos.	Moved Often	vs	Seldom Moved
2	6 mos.	Splashed in Bath	vs	Passive in Bath
3	1 yr.	Walked Rapidly, Ate Eagerly, Into Every- thing	vs	Did Not Walk or Walked Slowly
4	2 yrs.	Enjoyed Active Play	vs	Enjoyed Quiet Play
5	5 yrs.	Always Ran	vs	Seldom Ran
6	7 yrs.	Preferred Active Games	vs	Preferred Quiet Activities

EAPI - Early Activity Pattern Interview

- 1 - Level of activity as baby (active vs passive)
- 2 - Childhood preference for active vs quiet play
- 3 - Playmate pattern in early childhood (group vs solitary).

EAPTOT - Early Activity Patterns Total Score (EAPQ + EAPI).

Note: A frequency distribution for the data presented in this table can be found in Section V of Appendix E.

which were found to separate the groups are outlined below.

On the EAP questionnaire, participant children were reported to have been more active as two month old infants (i.e., moving often in sleep, when changing diaper and while being dressed), and more active at one year of age (i.e., climbing into everything, eager eating, rapid walking), than were non-participant children ($P \leq .01$). A greater number of participant children were also reported to have preferred active games to quiet games at seven years of age, when compared to non-participant children ($P \leq .001$).

On the EAP interview, participant children were reported to have been more active, as babies, than were non-participant children ($P \leq .05$). While 56.3 percent of the participant children were described as being very active babies, only 18.8 percent of the non-participant children were described in this manner. More participant children were reported to have played primarily with a group, rather than by themselves, during early childhood ($P \leq .001$). Seventy-five percent of the participants as opposed to 12.4 percent of the non-participants played primarily with a group (small or large) during early childhood. Furthermore, 50 percent of the non-participants were reported to have played primarily by themselves or with only one person, whereas none of the participants fell under this category.

Present Activity Patterns of Child

The data indicates that there were significant differences in the present activity patterns of participant and non-

participant children (Table 16). The Present Activity Pattern (PAP) total scores were higher for participant than for non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). The individual items found to differentiate the groups are outlined below.

On the PAP questionnaire, participant children were rated as more competitive, aggressive, and attracted to competitive games when compared to non-participant children ($P \leq .01$). Participants were also reported to have a greater preference for active games requiring a great deal of energy ($P \leq .05$).

On the PAP interview, participant children were described as being more mature in physical appearance ($P \leq .05$), and more physically active than were non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). With reference to the latter point, 56.3 percent of the participants were described as being more physically active than other boys their own age, whereas no non-participant children were described in this manner. Conversely, 50 percent of the non-participants, and none of the participants, were described as being less physically active than other boys their own age.

A greater number of participants were reported to have always been active when compared to non-participants ($P \leq .01$). While 56.3 percent of the participant children were reported to have always been active, only 18.8 percent of the non-participant children were reported as such. Participant children were also reported to have had more physically active keen interests in the last year or so, when compared to non-participant children ($P \leq .001$). For example 87.5 percent of

TABLE 16

PRESENT ACTIVITY PATTERNS OF CHILD: MEANS,
STANDARD DEVIATIONS, WELCH'S T-TEST AND TWO
SIDED PROBABILITY FOR BOTH PARTICIPANT AND
NON-PARTICIPANT GROUPS (5 POINT SCALE)

Item	Participant		Non-Participant		Welch's T-Test	Probability Two Tailed
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
PAPQ1	4.31	0.79	3.81	1.10	1.80	0.0913
2	3.75	1.18	2.87	1.14	3.05	0.0081**
3	4.12	1.02	3.62	0.95	2.08	0.0541*
4	3.75	1.06	3.50	0.81	1.22	0.2395
5	2.68	0.94	2.25	1.23	1.41	0.1780
6	3.75	1.12	3.12	1.20	2.07	0.0554
PAPI1	3.25	1.23	2.68	0.87	2.57	0.0210*
2	3.56	0.72	2.31	0.79	6.30	0.0000***
3	4.25	1.00	3.12	1.36	3.30	0.0047**
4	4.37	0.71	1.87	1.08	9.19	0.0000***
PAPTOT	37.81	5.96	29.18	6.15	5.60	0.0000***

* $P \leq .05$; ** $P \leq .01$; *** $P \leq .001$.

Designations:

PAPQ - Present Activity Pattern Questionnaire

PAPQ

Item	High Score		Low Score
1	Loves Physical Activity	vs	Avoids Physical Activity
2	Competitive and Aggressive	vs	Not Competitive or Aggressive
3	Prefers Active Games	vs	Prefers Quiet Games
4	Prefers Group Play	vs	Prefers Solitary Play
5	Takes Risks and Chances	vs	Takes No Risks or Chances
6	Eager to Try New Things	vs	Not Eager to Try New Things

PAPI - Present Activity Pattern Interview

- 1 - Maturity of boy (physical appearance)
- 2 - Amount of present physical activity
- 3 - Patterns of activity over years to present
- 4 - Keen Interests (physically active or quiet).

PAPTOT - Present Activity Patterns Total Score (PAPQ + PAPI).

Note: A frequency distribution for the data presented in this table can be found in Section VI of Appendix E.

the participants' mothers, as opposed to 6.2 percent of the non-participants' mothers, indicated that their sons' had many active interests and were keen on physical activities. Furthermore, 56.3 percent of the non-participant children were not reported to have any physically active interests, whereas no participant children were in this category.

Mothers' Attitude about Sports

The attitudinal data (Table 17) indicates that mothers of participant children had a more positive attitude towards sports than did mothers of non-participant children ($P \leq .05$). Mothers of participant children rated sports as being more good than bad ($P \leq .01$), more worthwhile ($P \leq .001$), and more pleasant ($P \leq .05$), and more happy than sad ($P \leq .05$) when compared to mothers of non-participant children. None of the other attitudinal designations (sweet vs sour, nice vs awful, clean vs dirty, relaxed vs tense) differentiated between mothers of participant and non-participant children.

Fathers' Attitude about Sports

The attitudinal data indicates that there were no significant differences between the sports attitudes of fathers of participant and non-participant children (Table 18). None of the individual attitudinal designations nor the total attitude score, differentiated fathers of participant and non-participant children.

TABLE 17

MOTHERS' ATTITUDE ABOUT SPORT: MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, WELCH'S T-TEST AND TWO SIDED PROBABILITY FOR BOTH PARTICIPANT AND NON-PARTICIPANT GROUPS (7 POINT SCALE)

Item	Participant		Non-Participant		Welch T Test	Probability Two Tailed
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
1	6.56	1.03	5.62	1.08	3.44	0.0035**
2	6.93	0.25	5.93	0.77	5.18	0.0001***
3	6.25	1.06	5.43	1.36	2.38	0.0309*
4	4.37	1.02	4.31	1.38	0.22	0.8291
5	5.18	1.27	5.43	0.96	-1.03	0.3159
6	6.06	1.06	5.31	1.25	2.40	0.0298*
7	4.68	1.13	4.31	1.13	1.31	0.2073
8	4.06	1.84	4.12	1.54	-0.16	0.8735
Total Score	44.12	6.05	40.50	5.59	2.59	0.0204*

* $P \leq .05$; ** $P \leq .01$; *** $P \leq .001$.

Designations:

<u>Item</u>	<u>High Score</u>		<u>Low Score</u>
1	Good	vs	Bad
2	Worthwhile	vs	Worthless
3	Pleasant	vs	Unpleasant
4	Sweet	vs	Sour
5	Nice	vs	Awful
6	Happy	vs	Sad
7	Clean	vs	Dirty
8	Relaxed	vs	Tense

Note: A frequency distribution for the data presented in this table can be found in Section VII of Appendix E.

TABLE 18

FATHERS' ATTITUDE ABOUT SPORT: MEANS, STANDARD
DEVIATIONS, WELCH'S T-TEST AND TWO SIDED
PROBABILITY FOR BOTH PARTICIPANT AND
NON-PARTICIPANT GROUPS (7 POINT SCALE)

Item	Participant		Non-Participant		Welch T Test	Probability Two Tailed
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
1	6.68	0.60	6.18	0.98	2.03	0.059
2	6.68	0.60	6.18	0.98	2.03	0.059
3	6.31	0.87	5.68	1.44	1.72	0.104
4	4.43	1.03	4.18	0.54	1.83	0.085
5	5.06	1.12	4.93	1.06	0.47	0.644
6	4.87	1.20	5.18	1.04	-1.19	0.250
7	5.00	1.09	5.06	1.06	-0.23	0.817
8	3.37	1.58	3.93	1.61	-1.39	0.182
Total Score	42.43	3.40	41.37	4.28	0.99	0.337

Designations:

<u>Item</u>	<u>High Score</u>		<u>Low Score</u>
1	Good	vs	Bad
2	Worthwhile	vs	Worthless
3	Pleasant	vs	Unpleasant
4	Sweet	vs	Sour
5	Nice	vs	Awful
6	Happy	vs	Sad
7	Clean	vs	Dirty
8	Relaxed	vs	Tense

General Demographic Information

The data indicates that participant and non-participant children were virtually the same in terms of age, height, weight, number of children in the family, fathers' educational level, mothers' educational level, and socio-economic status (Table 19). Additional information, not quantified for statis-

TABLE 19

GENERAL DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION: MEANS, STANDARD
DEVIATIONS, WELCH'S T-TEST AND TWO SIDED PROBABILITY
FOR BOTH PARTICIPANT AND NON-PARTICIPANT GROUPS

Item	Participant		Non-Participant		Welch T Test	Probability Two Tailed
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
1	107.50	7.14	107.37	6.42	0.07	0.93
2	52.45	1.98	53.10	2.08	-1.25	0.22
3	67.59	10.77	66.37	8.33	0.58	0.56
4	3.12	0.80	3.56	1.36	-1.28	0.21
5	7.00	1.09	6.31	1.77	1.54	0.14
6	5.25	1.34	5.37	1.50	-0.33	0.74
7	62.62	10.83	62.70	11.42	-0.03	0.97

Designations:

Item

- 1 - Age in months
- 2 - Height in inches
- 3 - Weight in pounds
- 4 - Children in family (number)
- 5 - Fathers' educational level (8 point scale)
- 6 - Mothers' educational level (8 point scale)
- 7 - Socio-economic level (Blissen Scale).
Maximum possible range (25.36-76.69).

tical analysis, follows directly.

With reference to ordinal position (birth order), each group was comprised of four first borns and twelve latter borns. Further information concerning ordinal position revealed that 68.8 percent of the participants and 56.3 percent of the non-participants had older brothers. It was also found that 18.8 percent of the participants and 50 percent of the non-participants had older sisters.

When the mothers were asked what their occupation was,

93.8 percent of both groups indicated that they were housewives and the remaining 6.2 percent of each group listed part-time jobs. It was found that 87.5 percent of the participants' mothers and 75 percent of the non-participants' mothers had lived in Canada for more than 15 years, with the remainder of each group having lived in Canada for less than 10 years. In addition to this, 93.8 percent of the participants' mothers and 75 percent of the non-participants' mothers indicated that they never used a language other than English in their home.

III. VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

The validity of an instrument is the degree to which it measures what it has been designed to measure. In order to assess the validity of a particular measuring device, a criterion index is needed for making a comparison. The criterion groups utilized for validating the FSE, CSE, and AP interview schedules were children who, in fact, did and did not participate in sport (as reflected by their behavior) and the parents of these same children. These existing populations were believed to differ on each item measured by these instruments. The overall discriminating ability of each item was determined by t-tests between groups on each item.

On the Family Sports Environment (FSE) interview, 25 of the 26 items differentiated between groups ($P \leq .01$), with 23 of these differences registering beyond the .001 level of significance. Twenty of the 24 items on the Child Sports

Environment (CSE) interview differentiated between groups ($P \leq .05$), with 13 of these differences registering beyond the .001 level of significance. On the interviews concerned with the child's early and present activity patterns (AP), 6 of the 7 items differentiated between groups ($P \leq .05$), with 3 items registering significance beyond the .001 level.

The extent to which the interview schedules separated participant and non-participant children and their families contributes to their validity. The internal consistency of each instrument was evidenced by the consistency with which the individual items separated the groups. The data supports the conclusion that the FSE, CSE, and AP interview schedules are valid discriminators between two criterion groups with respect to at least those items previously mentioned.

In order to obtain a measure of inter-rater reliability on the various instruments, 8 subjects (4 children and 4 mothers) were selected at random for a reliability check. The researcher and two other raters assessed the taped interviews which had been conducted with each of these subjects. One rater was a male, physical education graduate student while the other was a female, family-living teacher. The inter-rater reliability coefficients, indicated the extent to which each instrument can be reliably scored by different raters.

On the FSE interviews, the inter-rater reliability coefficients ranged from 0.82 to 0.97, with an average of 0.93. On the CSE interviews the range was from 0.88 to 0.98, with an

average of 0.94, and on the Activity Pattern (AP) interviews, the coefficients ranged from 0.80 to 1.00, with an average of 0.91. The significant inter-rater correlation coefficients between the researcher and the two external raters confirmed the scoring reliability of the interview schedules (Table 20).

IV. INTERVIEW EXCERPTS

Some of the most pertinent and relevant information collected in the study was obtained in response to open ended questions, in an interview setting. In the following section are some children's and parents' excerpts which were quoted directly from these interviews. A sample case has been presented for each of the following categories: Children - participant, non-participant, drop-out; Mothers - participant, non-participant, drop-out.

Additional interview excerpts can be found in Appendix F.

Children's Excerpts

Participant Children. The following excerpts are direct quotations taken from an interview with a participant child. Participant children had previous experience in organized sport and were still active. These excerpts were presented to aid one in gaining insight into the views held by participant children. The remainder of the participant children's excerpts can be found in Section I of Appendix F.

TABLE 20

INTER-RATER RELIABILITY FOR FSE, CSE, AND AP
INTERVIEWS: PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION
COEFFICIENTS

Family Sports Environment (FSE) Interview
(26 Questions)

<u>Rater</u>	<u>Subject 1</u>	<u>Subject 2</u>	<u>Subject 3</u>	<u>Subject 4</u>
1 vs 2	.97***	.94***	.94***	.82***
1 vs 3	.98***	.95***	.95***	.86***

Child Sports Environment (CSE) Interview
(24 Questions)

<u>Rater</u>	<u>Subject 1</u>	<u>Subject 2</u>	<u>Subject 3</u>	<u>Subject 4</u>
1 vs 2	.98***	.94***	.94***	.98***
1 vs 3	.88***	.97***	.88***	.98***

Activity Pattern (AP) Interview (7 Questions)
Early Activity Pattern Interview and
Present Activity Pattern Interview

<u>Rater</u>	<u>Subject 1</u>	<u>Subject 2</u>	<u>Subject 3</u>	<u>Subject 4</u>
1 vs 2	1.00***	.88**	.93***	.88**
1 vs 3	.93***	.80*	1.00***	.88**

* $P \leq .05$; ** $P \leq .01$; *** $P \leq .001$.

Designations:

Rater 1 - The Researcher

Rater 2 - Physical Education Graduate Student (male)

Rater 3 - Family-Living Teacher (female).

Case 1 (P 2): Age 8

Q. Do you think your father or mother expect you to be an athlete or expect you to take part in sports?

A. They expect me to be an athlete.

Q. How good do you think you could be at sports?

A. Very good.

Q. If you could be anybody in the world, who would you want to be?

A. Guy Lafleur.

Q. Why?

A. 'Cause he's on the Montreal Canadians and he's good.

Q. Do you like to play sports?

A. Yes, I like sports a lot.

Q. Is there anything you'd like to see changed in sports to make them better?

A. No, I like it the way it is.

Q. Do you think you will always want to go out for a sport team?

A. Yes.

Non-Participant Children. The following excerpts are direct quotations taken from an interview with a non-participant child. Non-participant children had never participated in organized sports and these excerpts revolve around the children's reasons for not participating. The remainder of the non-participant children's excerpts are presented in Section II of Appendix F.

Case 1 (NP 24): Age 9

Q. Why do you think you didn't go out for a team this year?

A. I don't play a lot of sports and I hardly play any.

Q. Why don't you play much sports?

A. Some I don't like... some I like a bit but they only have practicing... not real games.

Q. What do you mean?

A. Well, all you do is throw a ball back and forth and hit it a couple of times... but you don't run or run to the bases or anything... you're not playing against a team.

Q. In the sports you don't like, what is it that you don't like?

A. Well baseball I don't like hitting the ball and running and catching. I don't like any of it.

Q. How could you change sports so you would like it more?

A. Well, I'd make it so you didn't have to run too far... and it would be quite easy... mostly kicking and not hitting.

Drop-Out Children. Several subjects in this study were classified as athletic drop-outs. These youngsters had previously participated in organized sport but had now become non-participants in sport. Interviews were conducted with each of these children in an attempt to ascertain why they had dropped out at such an early age. Excerpts from one of these interviews have been presented below, with the remaining cases being presented in Section III of Appendix F.

Case 1 (NP 26): Age 9 Started soccer at 8, dropped out at 8 (about 3/4 way through season)

Q. How did you like playing soccer?

A. It was sorta fun...

Q. Are you going to go out again?

A. I was planning on it but I don't think I will.

Q. Did you play for the whole season?

A. For the last 3 games I didn't play but the other games I did.

Q. Why did you decide to stop?

A. 'Cause whenever we had a game I was usually an extra so I didn't get to play very much... the most I ever got to play was about 15 minutes.

Q. So what did you do during the game?

A. Just stand around and let the mosquitoes eat me.

- Q. Were there a lot of kids who didn't play?
A. Yes, there were a lot of extra's... didn't get to play.
- Q. Why didn't they get to play?
A. 'Cause there was already enough guys.
- Q. What do you like least about sports?
A. Baseball.
- Q. Why?
A. Well, most of the time you're in outfield anyway and you hardly every catch one... they hardly ever come out that far. I get too bored.
- Q. Is there anything you'd like to see changed in sports to make them better?
A. Baseball maybe... make the field smaller and the bases a little shorter.
- Q. Would you like to be an athlete or a member of a little league team?
A. No.
- Q. Why not?
A. Well, you just waste time... like you could do some other good stuff... like build something or something like that.
- Q. Would you like to be good at sports?
A. Yes.
- Q. How good?
A. Perfect.
- Q. Why would you want to be perfect?
A. So when I wanted to play I could play.
- Q. What do you think it would be like for you this year if you went out for the team?
A. I wouldn't make it... I don't think I would.
- Q. If you thought you would surely make the team would you go out for it?
A. Yes.

Mother's Excerpts

Participant Mothers. The following excerpts are direct quotations taken from an interview with the mother of a participant child. The remaining participants' mothers' excerpts can

be found in Section IV of Appendix F.

Case 1 (P 6)

Q. Do you have any expectations of your boy participating or not participating in sports?

A. We feel strongly that we'd like J. to play hockey... not necessarily to be good but to really enjoy it... and skiing ...we really feel very strongly about that as a family sport... not any great expectations but it should be a part of their lives... very much so.

Q. How do you think you've encouraged him to get involved in sports?

A. Probably by example... you know we enjoy it and we participate with them... you know skating and skiing. I'm sure this is why they like it.

Q. Is there anything you dislike about sports?

A. I think some of this organized hockey gets a bit out of control. You know how they have the boys so terribly organized in their games and they're switching players... they're trying to find the best players and I think they kind of use the boys a bit.

This idea about one player not being able to join this team because he's not good enough to play on it... you know... I think team sports are really great for children and if they get too competitive it loses its point of it all... really!

When J. was playing hockey at 6 or 7 he only got to play about 5 minutes in the whole game. The rest of the time he was just sitting there getting cold. One day when he was only six or seven he came home and said he was giving up hockey. He would have quit if we hadn't encouraged him to continue.

I think they should let everyone play for the enjoyment. Those who want to be competitive and get to the top will do so anyway. Everyone should be involved.

Q. What sorts of activities should be offered through the community?

A. They should have grass hockey 'cause not all little boys can skate. For the kids who can't skate... they're way behind and there's really nothing for them in the winter. They also have nothing for girls. They should offer things through the school but the school doesn't provide any leisure activities for the kids in grades 1-3. They can't play floor hockey at lunch, they can't play football. They should have skiing and skating and hockey for the kids. The rink and ski hills is right there. The kids aren't even allowed to change until grade 4. That's too late.

My boy who loves physical activity doesn't even like gym. The teacher wrote on his report card... 'If J. would learn to sit still and listen he would get much more out of gym.' He's been sitting all day long!

There are lots of mothers in the neighbourhood like myself who would gladly go in and help with a gym class so the kids have an hour of enjoyment.

Even in the school concert the kids must audition to be in it. So if you haven't had some training outside school you can't be involved. How can kids become enthused when they're not allowed to become involved!

Non-Participant Mothers. The following excerpts are direct quotations taken from an interview with the mother of a child who had never participated in organized sports. The remainder of the non-participants' mothers' excerpts can be found in Section V of Appendix F.

Case 1 (NP 25)

Q. Were you ever active in sports or athletics?

A. I just did it for enjoyment; I knew I'd never get anywhere in competition.

My husband played football and broke his collar bone.

I'd tried to take the boys skiing but they weren't too interested because all their friends were so much more progressed.

Q. Are your children involved in sports?

A. No. They're not good enough so they never get approached; they feel left out, I think.

Q. Does your husband read about sports in the newspaper?

A. Not very often... I don't read it period... couldn't care less.

Q. Do you watch sports on television?

A. I'm not interested in watching... it bores me to tears. I'd rather do it myself... badly, but do it myself. My husband watches every game that is on... I just leave. The boys aren't so interested in watching it which makes me happy... I think they should do more.

E. (son) roots for the winners... he always likes to be on the winning side... and he switches. He'll cheer for one team half way and switch to the team that is winning.

Q. Do you have any expectations of him participating or not participating?

A. I know he'd like to play with the gang but since he has troubles, period, playing together with anybody, I don't think he'll excel anywhere where sports are concerned. He likes to do things he can do on his own like hunting.

Q. Would you like him to be involved in sports?

A. Yes, definitely. I think it would help him and I just don't want him to be involved, I want him to succeed at something... because he has his troubles in school; maybe if he got a bit of confidence in some sort of sport it would help him... his overall respect of himself, you know.

Q. What do you dislike about sports?

A. I don't like organized sports for kids because the grown-ups go in and manage it... I remember playing ball with my friends without anybody telling me I have to do it this way and that way... and just plain old doing it for the fun of it. I think there's very little fun in organized sports for children... there's too much pressure put on them. I wouldn't want to play under those conditions.

Q. Where do you think the pressure comes from?

A. From the grown-ups... they want little Billy-boy to be just as good as his daddy used to be or as good as everybody wants to make him believe that daddy was. There's a hell of a lot of pressure put on these kids.

When I think of that little league crap... they take it all so very seriously, the parents and the kids. I think it would have been much better if they (the kids) would have had a rabble-rousing thing in some sand pit without any grown-ups... and just have fun.

All you need is an empty field and a ball.

Let's face it; everybody is not meant to excel... there's so few who are tops in their field... why should all the others never get a chance to do it. Many never get a chance to do... they stand on the side lines and watch when they'd be much better off going and getting a little group and doing it themselves... lousily but somehow. The ones who aren't good don't get a chance... they don't even make the team.

There's a coach we know who's wandering around with great power talking about how he cut this kid and that kid. It's a big ego trip for him but how about 700,000 other kids? He does get a real sense of satisfaction from hammering these kids who are 12 or 13.

I think this is where it is wrong... it seems that kid's sports nowadays aren't to exercise the body... they are meant to eliminate the bad ones so you finally get a fine good national team going, with lots of money behind it. Like... who's this toothless guy who raises cows...

how he is idolized... Bobby Hull. That's organized sports which just gripes me to no end. That's what the Caesar's used to say with their populace... give them bread and circuses... that's all it is... that's a social ill. Keep the masses occupied and happy.

Drop-Out Mothers. The following excerpts are direct quotations taken from an interview with the mother of a child who had dropped out of organized sport. The remainder of the drop-out mothers' excerpts are located in Section VI of Appendix F.

Case 1 (NP 29):

Q. What do you dislike about sports?

A. The organized sports... the pressure is so bad... we have to win... I find the pressure in hockey is terrible... most of the pressure comes from the parents... the emphasis should be on learning to play well and having a pleasant experience and learning to get along with kids. I think the fun comes from relaxing and enjoying it... why would some little 8 year old kid have to win? Let him play for fun... and if he's really good he's going to win.

Three little boys along with my son told me there was a coach in the little league and he hit a little boy in the face. This team was very good and it was going to finish first apparently... the attitude was: 'we're going to win?' and he hit that little boy so hard his nose bled. This was bad and my son was very upset over this and he didn't want to play for a while... but I think he realized his coach wouldn't hit anyone. Now he will watch hockey as a spectator but he will not take part in it... he has in fact emphatically said he will not.

One day he came home and said: 'I want to try out for baseball', about four weeks before it started... I said 'fine'... when it came down, the day I knew he had to go... he said: 'I don't want to go'... I said: 'Oh, but you're going because you made a commitment and you're going'... 'Oh no, I'm not going, I don't want to go... I'll do everything wrong'.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

This chapter has been broadly divided into four sections; the first section dealing with a discussion of the children's responses, the second with a discussion of the parents' responses, the third with a general discussion on children's sports, and the fourth section with a theory of early participation in sport. All of the basic hypotheses formulated at the outset were supported by the data (except for Hyp. M,N,O).

I. DISCUSSION OF CHILDREN'S RESPONSES

Child Sports Environment

Expectancy of positive or negative consequences appears to play a critical role in determining whether or not a child elects to participate in sports. Children who elected to participate in sport expected that going out for a team would be a positive experience, while children who did not elect to participate tended to expect it to be a negative experience. Negative expectancies were evidenced by expressions such as: not being able to make the team, not being any good, being scared, getting in the way, and not liking it. These negative expectancies appeared to play a very significant role in avoidance behavior as far as sports participation was concerned. Positive expectancies were evidenced by expressions such as: being able to make the team easily, being good, and having lots of fun. Participant children expected to make

the team and to be good at sports. They also felt that their parents expected them to participate in sports, and expected to please their parents by participating. Participant children perceived sports as something important to them, and sports held a priority position in terms of the things they liked to do most.

The participant children also had more positive attitudes towards sports than did the non-participant children, which appeared to be consistent with their behavior. Participant children tended to see sports as more worthwhile, good, and nice than did non-participant children, which is probably a reflection of their sports environment, their expectancies from sports participation, and their sport related experiences.

The findings of this study support the theory of motivation as expounded by Birch and Veroff (1966) inasmuch as they contend that whether or not an action occurs depends on the relative strength of expectancies for positive and negative consequences. The tendency for people to operate on positive and negative expectancies is also developed by Manis and Meltzer (1968), and Bandura and Walters (1963).

Kagan (1966) has maintained that educators have grossly minimized the critical role which a child's expectancy of failure plays in shaping his school behavior. Physical educators and coaches have also been guilty of minimizing (or ignoring) the profound affect that expectancy of failure can have in shaping a child's sporting behavior. In this study, expectancy of failure (or fear of failure) appeared to have

had an affect upon many children's desire to participate in sport. This was evidenced by responses of non-participant and drop-out children in that they did not expect to be good enough to make the team (or to play regularly). In certain cases the children appeared to be influenced by the fear of failing to the extent of being afraid to participate.

This study also supported the contention that basic orientation toward experience is established early in life. Pressy and Kuhlen (1957) and Mussen, Conger and Kagan (1963) maintain that failure to establish positive interests in childhood may result in significant gaps which persist throughout life. The Fels longitudinal studies indicated that children who adopted certain activities (e.g. athletics) during the early school years often retained this orientation through adolescence and adulthood. The concept of the child being father to the man is supported in the present investigation by the fact that many non-participant (and drop-out) children indicated that they never (or never again) want to go out for a sports team. Contrarily, many of the participant children indicated that they will always want to go out for a sports team.

Self Perception of Sports Ability

Although no differences were found between the self-concepts of participant and non-participant children, there were differences in their perceptions of self when related specifically to sports. Participant children tended to see

themselves as good at sports while non-participant children saw themselves as not very good at sports. Participants also thought they had the ability to be very proficient at sports in the future, whereas non-participants tended not to think in this manner. Self perception of sports ability ties in very closely with the concept of expectancy (or perceived consequences) from sports participation and it is contended that perception of sports ability is an important factor influencing a child's attraction to or avoidance of sports participation. His self perception of sports ability can influence his subjectively held probability that the behavior (participation) will be reinforced, which in turn can influence his actual behavior. If the child has a negative self perception of sports ability and has also learned that you either do something well or do not do it at all, the probability of him participating is very low. It could be contended that only by altering the child's expectations, will it be possible to alter his behavior.

Active and Quiet Interests

With reference to active interests, 93.8 percent of the participant children indicated that they would like to: go swimming, shoot targets with a bow and arrow or b-b gun, play hockey, play football, and go camping. Of the non-participant children, 87.5 percent indicated that they would like to: climb trees, go camping, explore caves, go sledding in the snow, and shoot targets with a bow and arrow or b-b gun. It

is interesting to note that the top five choices of the non-participant children can be thought of in terms of individual, non-competitive activities, whereas at least two (possibly more) of the participants' top choices have a team and/or competitive orientation. Non-participant children also had a greater number of quiet interests than did participant children, most of which tended to be individualistic and non-competitive.

Personality Traits

Several differences were found between participant and non-participant children with respect to their personality traits. The children who elected to participate in sport were found to be more dominant, more happy-go-lucky, more venturesome, more toughminded, and more extraverted than the non-participant children. A brief description of each of these traits follows directly.

On Factor E (dominant versus submissive), the high scoring child is described as relatively active, assertive, and aggressive while the low scoring child is more docile. On Factor F (happy-go-lucky versus sober), the high scoring child is described as rather enthusiastic, optimistic, and self confident while the low scoring child is more serious and self depreciating. On Factor H (venturesome versus shy), the high scoring child is described as sociable in the sense that he interacts freely and boldly with people while the low scoring child is shy, sensitive, easily threatened, prefers

one or two close friends to groups or crowds, and seeks to avoid open competition, over-stimulation, or social threat through withdrawal. On Factor I (toughminded versus tenderminded), the high scoring child (tenderminded) tends to show greater dependency, fearful avoidance of physical threat, fastidious aversion for rough games and rough people, and more sympathy for the needs of others while the low scoring child (toughminded) is more independent, tough, and "thick-skinned". A high score on the second order factor (extraversion versus introversion) indicates that the child is more extraverted (e.g., sociable, outgoing, stimulation seeking, confident, etc.).

Two major assumptions have been proposed in an effort to explain personality trait differences found between athletes and non-athletes at higher age levels (e.g., high school and college age). They are usually stated as:

Assumption #1. Sports participation influences the personality structure.

Assumption #2. Individuals with certain personality structures elect to participate in sports.

The findings of this study would tend to support the second assumption indicating that children with certain personality structures elect to participate in sports. There appears to be a greater tendency for more active, aggressive, assertive children to participate than for shy and docile children, other things being equal. The fact that eight- and nine-year old sports participants were found to be more

dominant, venturesome, toughminded, happy-go-lucky, and extraverted than eight- and nine-year old non-participants in sports tended to support this assumption. There may also be a tendency for certain types of children to become early drop-outs. For example, children who are sensitive and easily threatened (low H scorers) are likely more threatened when they begin participation and are probably more sensitive to negative stimulation.

Three previous studies have been done which attempted to obtain some measure of personality with young athletic children. Seymour (1956) and Skubic (1956) studied little league baseball players and Rarick and McKee (1949) studied grade three children with high and low motor proficiency. All three studies utilized subjective ratings of teachers in order to assess the personality traits of the children. Although the subjective ratings on these different studies were not equatable, the athletic children were generally rated in a more positive manner on the traits measured. For example Rarick and McKee's high proficiency group was described as active and attentive, whereas the low proficiency group was described as shy and retiring. The findings of the present study, along with the supportive data from these previous studies, tend to lead one to the conclusion that personality can make a child more or less susceptible to participation in sport.

It should be pointed out that the participant children in this study were all hockey players with previous experience

in sports. However, personality differences which exist at this age level are more likely a function of the child's past seven years of life than the one or two seasons in which he was involved on a sports team. Perhaps the participant children were found to be more venturesome, more assertive, etc., because their parents had reinforced these sorts of behaviors during their early years. This contention is supported by the fact that mothers of participant children reported that over the years they encouraged active play as opposed to quiet play more often than did the mothers of non-participant children. Parents of participant children may have likewise reinforced (directly or indirectly) outgoing or aggressive behavior. The parental models available to the children may also have been a source of the child's behavioral and personality patterns. Parents of participant children were found to exhibit more active patterns of behavior than parents of non-participant children.

The fact that the young children (participants and non-participants) in the study have a few different personality traits does not necessarily imply that sports participation has no influence on the personality structure or that some process of elimination (based on personality) does not occur. In the sporting system, as it exists today, certain types of behavior (e.g., aggressiveness) are probably reinforced and, in certain cases, boys who do not exhibit these traits may be eliminated from the ranks. Whether or not sports participation influences a boy positively or negatively will be

largely dependent upon the reinforcement contingencies set up by the individual coaches. The type of behavior being reinforced may also be partially dependent upon the requirements of the particular sport.

II. DISCUSSION OF PARENTS' RESPONSES

Family Sports Environment

The most significant and consistent differences found between participant and non-participant children in this study was with reference to the family sports environments from which they emerged. It would appear that parents have a very significant influence on their children (at this age) in terms of whether or not they participate in organized sports. The findings indicate that, for eight- and nine-year old boys, parents are the most contagious models of behavior as well as the most important reinforcers with respect to being socialized into sport. If the child emerges from a positive family sports environment where (1) the parents (one or both) participate in sports themselves, (2) the parents attend games and watch sports, (3) the parents have definite expectations and aspirations regarding the child's participation, and (4) the parents encourage the child to participate, the probability of the child participating is extremely high. Conversely, if the child comes from a negative or low positive family sports environment where none or few of these life forces are operating, the probability of the child participat-

ing is very low.

These data indicate that any "average" child placed in a very positive family sports environment will almost surely be an early participant in sport regardless of other factors. In several cases brothers described as complete opposites in terms of personality, level of activity, size, etc., were either both participants or both non-participants in sports, depending upon their family sports environment. Once a child does become an early sports participant (seven- or eight-years old), whether or not he continues becomes largely dependent upon the positive and negative reinforcements operating in the organized sport environment, as well as in the home.

The findings of this study support (and are supported by) the socialization and family related studies cited in the review of literature. This is especially true for literature dealing with the socialization process and the importance of role models. Bandura (1969) and Bandura and Walters (1963) have emphasized the importance of modeling and reinforcement contingencies in the acquisition and modification of behavior. Mussen, Conger, and Kagan (1963) contend that people are the major source of motivation and reinforcement for other people and look to the social environment to explain behavior. Also in this context, McNeil (1969) points out the important role that parents play in socializing a child.

In the present study, parent(s) of children who elected to participate in sport were found to provide both a model of participation and positive reinforcement for sports behavior .

(as evidenced by their own participation and viewing habits, their encouragement and expectations regarding their child's participation, as well as their attitudes toward sports). These findings support previous sports research which looked, albeit superficially, at the family influence upon participation. These studies (Rarick and McKee, 1949; Skubic, 1956; Ruffer, 1965; Behrman, 1967; and Malumphy, 1968) indicated that parent(s) of participants were (or had been) active themselves and/or encouraged their children to participate.

Dependency Fostering-Overprotective Home Environment

As reflected by Mosychuk's DFO interview schedule, the home environments of participant children were less dependency fostering and overprotective than the home environments of non-participant children. An overprotective home environment was evidenced by consistent cautiousness training and structuring of situations to avoid any potential dangers or embarrassment for the child, as opposed to letting the child try new activities and go foreign places, which may involve exposure to degrading or dangerous elements.

The differing home environment finding for participant and non-participant children was also supported by the higher score of non-participant children on Factor I of the CPQ (toughmindedness versus tendermindedness). Research evidence indicates that the personality pattern associated with the high end of this scale is fostered by "overprotection" in upbringing.

It would seem unlikely that a young child from an over-protective home environment would be encouraged to participate in a contact sport, where his safety may be in jeopardy (i.e., ice hockey), and the data supports this supposition.

Activity Patterns

Participant children were reported to have been more active during infancy and early childhood than were non-participants. They also played primarily with a group, as opposed to playing by themselves or with one person, during early childhood, and preferred active games to quiet games during the early school years. These early activity patterns appeared to follow through to the present, as evidenced by the present activity patterns information.

Participant children were reported to be currently more competitive, aggressive, and attracted toward competitive games than were non-participant children. They were also shown to have a preference for active games requiring a great deal of energy, and were involved in more competitive games and sports than were non-participants. Mothers' descriptions of their children's activity patterns tended to agree with the behavioral descriptions accompanying the personality trait data (i.e., Factor E, H, I). Participant children were generally described by their mothers as having been always active.

Support for the findings in this study came from a study conducted by Rarick and McKee (1949) which indicated that

grade three children with superior motor proficiency engaged primarily in active, group play during early childhood and childhood, whereas children with inferior motor proficiency leaned toward quiet play with one or two pals.

The data in this study tends to support the findings of an extensive longitudinal study conducted by Thomas, Chess, and Birch (1970) which indicated that distinct differences in motor activities were evident within the first few weeks of life and tended to persist over the years in most children. The findings of this study also tend to support activation theory as propounded by Fiske and Maddi (1968). They maintain that one's level of activity becomes relatively fixed during childhood and that one has a tendency to maintain the level of activity to which he is accustomed.

It would appear that a child's level of activity (high or low activity) may make him either more or less susceptible to sports participation, other things being equal. It is possible that certain types of children seek activation while others avoid it, depending on their characteristic level of activation. For example a child who has "always been active" will probably continue to be active. The type of stimulation or activity the child seeks (or how he channels his activity) will be largely dependent upon his environment. Consequently, an "active" child exposed to a minimum or negative sports environment may channel his energies to something other than sports. Conversely, a "quiet" child who is exposed to a positive sports environment will in all probability become an

early participant in sports. It is also possible that a child's playmate patterns (group versus solitary) during his early years may influence his desire to be with a group or to avoid groups, which in turn would play a role in his attraction to or avoidance of team games.

III. DISCUSSION OF CHILDREN'S SPORTS

Revisions Needed in Children's Sports

This study indicates that the present sports system is in need of revision in order to provide personnel and activities that meet the needs and interests of different types of children from different types of backgrounds. The reward structure which now exists in organized sports does not appear to be consistent with what is in the best interest of the majority of the children. There appears to be an over-emphasis on winning at the expense of fun involvement. This gives rise to an elitest atmosphere wherein many youngsters eliminate themselves before they start while others begin to withdraw at seven- and eight-years of age. In many cases organized sports appeared to operate as extremely efficient screening processes for the elimination of children.

Over 80 percent of the mothers in this study expressed a dislike for the winning emphasis, the pressure, or the competitiveness in children's sports. They indicated that they would prefer to see these things de-emphasized and the emphasis put on fun and enjoyment, along with giving each

child an equal opportunity to play. Children were very aware of the fact that they had to be good to either make the team or to play regularly. Seventy-five percent of the non-participant children, all of whom thought they were not good enough to make the team, indicated that they would go out for a team if they thought they would surely make it.

Children who dropped out of sports at an early age appeared to be merely reacting to negative stimuli, which were largely a function of the structure of the game and the emphases of the coaches. For example, three drop-out children (two eight-year olds and one nine-year old) were asked how good they would like to be at sports and responded as follows:

"Perfect... so when I wanted to play I could play".

"Good enough so I could play sports and I wouldn't get fired on anything I went on".

"Really good... because if you're not the coach won't think very much about you".

The majority of the drop-out children indicated that they dropped out because: "they never let me play". A system which makes "being good" a prerequisite to playing would not appear to foster mass participation.

Many children (both participants and non-participants) indicated that they would like sports to be scaled down to their level. Some general suggestions made by the children towards this end included: making the games easier, cutting down the length of the games but increasing the actual playing time (as opposed to sitting), making the playing areas smaller, playing more and practicing less, cutting down on

boring repetition (e.g., drills), cutting down on the roughness, and promoting honesty and truthfulness in obeying rules.

The children also had some specific suggestions for improving several sports. Those pertaining to baseball and hockey are discussed below. Many children felt that baseball should be changed so they could hit the ball more often (at bat) and get the ball more often in the field. Some specific suggestions for accomplishing this included making the field smaller, the bases shorter, the bats bigger, allowing more swings at the ball and more outs to retire a side. In hockey, children indicated that they did not like being pushed around, checked, boarded, and getting cold. They would like to do more playing and less sitting around "freezing". They would also like to get the puck more often and to be able to skate better.

By implementing some of the children's suggestions, it would appear that many positive adjustments could be made in childrens' sports. For example, by scaling down the games, children will have a greater chance of attaining some success and will conceivably have a more enjoyable experience.

In attempting to provide for all types of children, it should also be remembered that many children in this study were not interested in activities of a highly competitive or team nature (i.e., child versus child or team versus team). More individual and/or non-competitive activities should be provided to meet the needs of these children and facilities should also be made available for children to "just play"

without any adult intervention. It should not be a case of "super-organized or unavailable", as one mother expressed it.

Promoting Mass Participation

This study has demonstrated the fact that a positive sports environment is highly correlated with participation in sport. Furthermore, the sports environment to which a child is exposed appears to have a direct affect upon his expectancies from participation, which in turn affects his behavior. In short, a child must have positive expectancies in order to become a participant and his participation must be reinforced accordingly, in order for him to continue participating.

In order to increase participation, children must be exposed to positive sports environments which serve to change any negative expectations to positive expectations. Positive alterations of a child's expectancies may come about by means of:

- (1) altering the parental expectations, who in turn alter the child's expectations,
- (2) positive exposure to activity in school, particularly the first few years,
- (3) positive exposure to activity in the community,
- (4) utilization of the mass media to promote participation.

It should be made clear that any steps taken to alter expectations (e.g., use of media), will be done in vain, unless the positive expectations become a positive reality in the child's "real world". Negative experiences (e.g., failure,

humiliation) will quickly alter future expectations and future behavior. Consequently, it is essential that knowledgeable people set up the programs and work with the children in both the elementary schools and the community league recreational programs.

If one is to seriously contemplate maximizing participation, it would seem imperative that all children receive positive, fun-filled exposures to activity in elementary school. Assumedly this will serve to alter a child's negative expectations as well as to reinforce his positive expectations. This is especially important for children who are negatively oriented to begin with. Certain types of children (i.e., from negative sports environments) may need a greater amount of encouragement and reassurance than other children (i.e., from positive sports environments). Children with negative expectations, who tend not to participate, may have to be repeatedly assured that there is a place for them as a participant in sport where they can have fun and experience success without being humiliated. The evidence indicates that people are vitally needed at this level (grades K through 6) who are sensitive to the needs of the children and who are also knowledgeable in the area of behavior modification.

The importance of a child having an early positive exposure to sports cannot be overemphasized, yet the vast majority of young sports participants are coached by non-professional laymen with little or no training, especially

in the psychological aspects of human development. It is imperative that minor league coaches, who collectively come into contact with millions of children, be made cognizant of the tremendous impact they can have on young children, as well as how they can function in the child's best interest. The findings of this study indicate that coaches who are working with young children should be focusing their attention on giving each child a positive experience, with the pursuit of winning kept in its proper perspective (as a secondary consideration at best). The coaches should be made aware of, and, in so far as possible, sensitive to the needs of the children.

IV. A THEORY OF EARLY PARTICIPATION IN SPORTS

Whether or not a child participates in sports is dependent primarily upon three factors: (1) the models available to the child, (2) the expectancies that the child has regarding participation, and (3) the reinforcement contingencies to which the child is exposed. While two other factors, personality and general level of activity, tend to make a child either more or less susceptible to sports, participation appears to be largely dependent upon environmental factors and the reinforcement contingencies operating within that environment.

Available Models. Children have a tendency to reproduce the actions, attitudes, and emotional responses exhibited by

real life or symbolized models. This is referred to as observational learning, identification, imitation, or modeling. Such models are utilized in all cultures as a means of behavioral acquisition. Children are continually taking the roles of those about them, especially those who are in some sense significant in their lives. Early in a child's life the parents are the most contagious models of behavior as well as the most significant reinforcers.

Children who begin to participate in organized sport at an early age (e.g., 5, 6, 7, or 8 years of age) generally have at least one parent who is (or has been) an effective model of this behavior. In some cases the child may also have significant other persons (besides parents) in their lives whose actions they are attempting to emulate or whose approval they are seeking. As childhood fuses with adolescence, the peer group becomes increasingly important as a behavioral determinant.

Expectancies. Whether or not a child actually comes in contact with the goal of participation is dependent upon his expectancies of positive or negative consequences. His expectancies are, however, contingent upon past associations and experiences as well as on what he has learned (observational learning) about sports from significant others. If he has observed these significant others (e.g., parents, brothers, peers, etc.) as having fun, receiving praise and so on as a result of participation, his expectancies will generally be positive and he will want to participate. People

are the primary sources of expectations, motivations, fears and rewards for other people. An individual's expectations and behavioral patterns can generally be traced to contact with significant others in his life and their attitudes and actions are readily communicable through indirect and direct means. If a child is surrounded by people who are interested in and enjoy activities, he falls readily into the pattern.

The desire of a young child to participate in sports arises largely from (1) an identification with parents who are effective models of sports behavior, and (2) a desire to please these parents who encourage this motive. Both these factors serve to increase the child's positive expectancies from sports participation. He expects certain positive things from having observed his parents actually taking part in sports and he expects that his own participation will please his parents. In short, the child elects to participate because he expects fun, approval, praise, attention and so on. If the child has negative expectancies, he will not likely elect to participate. A child's expectancy of success or failure, of approval or humiliation, of positive or negative consequences plays a critical role in shaping his sporting behavior. In this context, a child's self perception of his sports ability will also influence his attraction to or avoidance of sports, in so far as it affects his perception of how others will respond to his performance.

Reinforcement. The reinforcement a child receives from significant others regarding sports related activities influ-

ences his decision to participate or not to participate. Once a child decides to participate in a sport, his decision to continue or discontinue depends largely upon the contingencies of reinforcement which are operational for him. If a certain behavior (i.e., participation) is followed with positive reinforcement, the probability of it's reoccurrence on future occasions is increased. In short, the child must be somehow rewarded for his participation if he is to continue participating. Initially, the probability of the occurrence of a given behavior (i.e., sports participation) is determined by the strength of the expectancy that the behavior will be reinforced. The probability of reoccurrence of a similar kind of behavior is determined by the extent to which the child's behavior (or expectancy) was in fact reinforced. The child's positive expectancies must become a positive reality in order for him to continue to participate in sport. The initial exposures that a child has to sports appear to be to vitally important in shaping his sporting future. What happens at an early age level (i.e., positive or negative reinforcements) can have a significant impact upon his expectations and behavior for years to come.

In conclusion it would appear that a child becomes a participant in sport through a process of social learning. He is in a sense "shaped" into a sports participant by being exposed to role models and to a series of reinforcement contingencies. Sports participation is not something that just happens to a child... it is a process. In this shaping pro-

cess the child may be reinforced for any current response which contributes to the final pattern, such as reinforcing active play patterns early in life or by parents taking the child with them to participate in (or watch) sports. In most cases an important model is provided for the child and he is reinforced for sport related activities which contribute to the final pattern of sports participation.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I. SUMMARY

The central purpose of this study was to explore the question of why some children elected to participate in an organized, competitive sport and others did not. Specifically the investigation dealt with a group of 32 eight- and nine-year old boys, all of whom had easy access to the available sports programs in their community. The children were similar with respect to the major variables sometimes thought to affect the results of this type of study (i.e., age, sex, height, weight, grade, socio-economic level, parents' educational levels, school attended, availability of programs, facilities, and information, etc.). The boys were divided into two groups: 16 participants and 16 non-participants. A participant was a boy who had previously participated in organized hockey and who had elected to become involved again this season, whereas a non-participant was a boy who had elected not to take part in any of the organized sports. The sample was representative of the eight- and nine-year old boys in the community. Each boy and his mother were tested and interviewed with several instruments in an attempt to determine if any socio-psychological differences existed between participants and non-participants.

The investigation fell into two major areas of inquiry:

(1) the individual child, his interests, and his attitudes toward sport, and (2) his social environment. An attempt was made to look at both the social milieu within which the child operated and the affect of the environment on the child. The variables studied came primarily from literature concerned with socialization, behavioral acquisition, personality and child development. Though several standardized instruments were utilized, it was also necessary to construct a number of instruments pertaining specifically to the sports environments of the children and their parents. In all, twelve instruments provided the data for this study. Both questionnaires and interview schedules were utilized.

The variables studied were as follows: (1) the child's sports environment, (2) the family sports environment, (3) the child's self perception of his own sports ability, (4) the child's personality structure, (5) his self concept, (6) his active and quiet play interests, (7) his attitudes toward sports, (8) his mother's attitude towards sports, (9) his father's attitude towards sports, (10) the child's early activity patterns, (11) the child's current activity patterns, and (12) the dependency fostering and overprotection evident in the child's home environment.

II. CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the results from this study, the following conclusions seemed warranted:

1. Participation in sport was largely dependent upon environmental factors, particularly the family sports environment.
2. Three major factors within the child's environment appeared to account for his attraction to, or avoidance of sports participation: (a) the significant sport role models which were available to the child (i.e., parents), (b) the expectancies the child had regarding sports participation, and (c) the sport related reinforcement contingencies to which the child was exposed. Participation in sport was traced to positive role models of sports participation, positive expectancies from sports participation, and positive reinforcement for sport related activities, while avoidance of sports participation was traced to negative role models, negative expectancies, and negative reinforcements for sport related activities.

Some of the key differences which led to the previously stated conclusions are outlined below ($P < .001$ in all cases).

<u>Participants</u>	<u>Non-Participants</u>
<u>Role Models</u>	
Parent(s) had been athletes or members of competitive sports team	Parents had not been athletes or members of competitive sports team
Parent(s) were currently involved in physical activities	Parents were not currently involved in physical activities
Parent(s) attended live athletic events	Parents did not attend live athletic events
Parent(s) often watched sports on television	Parents seldom or never watched sports on television.

ParticipantsNon-ParticipantsRole Models

Parent(s) often read about sports in newspaper, magazines, books

Parents seldom or never read about sports

Child had sports literature available in the home

Child did not have sports literature in the home

Parent(s) had allegiance to sports team(s)

Parents did not have allegiance to sports team(s)

Family unit participated in physical activities together

Family unit did not participate in physical activities together

Siblings participated in sports

Siblings did not participate in sports

Expectancy

Expected to make the team

Did not expect to make the team

Expected to be proficient at sports

Did not expect to be proficient at sports

Expected positive things from sports participation

Expected negative things from sports participation

Felt parent(s) expected him to participate in sports

Did not feel parents expected him to participate in sports

Parent(s) had expectations of child participating in sports

Parents did not have expectations of child participating in sports

Reinforcement

Parent(s) encouraged child to participate in sports

Parents did not encourage child to participate in sports

Mother encouraged active play versus quiet play, over the years

Mother encouraged quiet play versus active play, over the years

<u>Participants</u>	<u>Non-Participants</u>
<u>Reinforcement</u>	
Father engaged in sport related activities with son	Father did not engage in sport related activities with son
Parent(s) watched child play or practice sport related activities	Parents did not watch child play or practice sport related activities
Parent(s) often discussed sports with son	Parents seldom or never discussed sports with son
Child received many sports items as gifts	Child received few or no sports items as gifts
Child had been enrolled in sports activities	Child had not been enrolled in sports activities

The "why" and the "why not" of children's sports participation was the focus of this investigation. The "why not" may indeed be the most vital question; by identifying the excluded child and his perspective we may be able to take the first step toward including him. However, sports participation research is still in the stages of infancy and a great deal of learning and research maturity will have to occur before we fully understand all the motivational factors surrounding the phenomenon of participation in sport.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, Alfred. The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1956.
- Alderman, R.B. "A Socio-Psychological Assessment of Attitudes Toward Physical Activity in Champion Athletes", Research Quarterly, 40:1-9, 1969.
- Aldrich, C.A., C. Sung, and C. Knop. "The Crying of Newborn Babies: II. The Individual Phase", J. Pediat., 27:89-96, 1945.
- Allport, G.W. Pattern and Growth in Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961.
- Anderson, C.C. "Psychological Contributions to Education: The Origin and Modification of Values", Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 11:4:203-215, 1965.
- Anderson, Norman H. "Scales and Statistics: Parametric and Nonparametric", In Readings in Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, Edited by E.F. Heermann and L.A. Braskamp. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Aspen, Alice A. "Tables for Use in Comparisons Whose Accuracy Involves Two Variances, Separately Estimated", Biometrika, 36:290-296, 1949.
- Asquith, Keith. "Attitudes Towards Physical Activity", (unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1971).
- Atkinson, J.W. An Introduction to Motivation. New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1964.
- Babladelis, Georgia, and Suzanne Adams. The Shaping of Personality. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- Baldwin, A.L. Theories of Child Development. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.
- Bandura, Albert. Principles of Behavior Modification. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.
- Bandura, A. "Behavioral Modification through Modeling Processes", In Research in Behavior Modification, Edited by L. Krasner and L.P. Ullmann, 1965.
- Bandura, Albert. "Behavioral Psychotherapy", Reprint from Scientific American, March, 1967.

- Bandura, Albert, and Richard H. Walters. Social Learning and Personality Development. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1963.
- Behrman, R.M. "Personality Differences Between Swimmers and Non-Swimmers", Research Quarterly, 38:163-171, 1967.
- Bell, Norman W., and Ezra F. Vogel. A Modern Introduction to the Family. New York: The Free Press, 1968.
- Biddulph, Lowell G. "Athletic Achievement and the Personal Social Adjustment of High School Boys", Research Quarterly, 25:1-7, March, 1954.
- Bing, E. "Effect of Childrearing Practices on Development of Differential Cognitive Abilities", Child Development, 34:631-648, 1963.
- Birch, D., and J. Veroff. Motivation: A Study of Action. Belmont: Brooks and Cole Publishing Company, 1966.
- Bird, E. "Personality Structure of Canadian Intercollegiate Women Ice Hockey Players", Contemporary Psychology of Sport, Edited by G.S. Kenyon. Chicago: The Athletic Institute, 1970.
- Blishen, B.R. "The Construction and Use of an Occupational Class Scale", Can. J. Econ. and Pol. Science, 24:519-531, 1958.
- Blishen, B.R. "A Socio-Economic Index for Occupations in Canada", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 4:1:41-53, 1967.
- Bonsall, M.R., Charles E. Meyers, and L.P. Thorpe. SRA Examiner Manual for What I Like To Do: An Inventory of Children's Interests. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1954.
- Bonsall, M.R., Charles E. Meyers, and L.P. Thorpe. Teachers' Handbook for What I Like To Do: An Inventory of Children's Interests. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1958.
- Booth, E.G. Jr. "Personality Traits of Athletes as Measured by the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI)", Research Quarterly, 29:127-138, 1958.
- Booth, E.G. Jr. "Personality Traits of Athletes as Measured by MMPI: A Rebuttal", Research Quarterly, 32:421-423, 1961.
- Bovyer, G. "Children's Concepts of Sportsmanship in the 4th, 5th, and 6th Grades", Research Quarterly, 34:282, 1963.

- Brim, O.G., and S. Wheeler. Socialization after Childhood: Two Essays, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Brindley, E.D. "Interschool Athletics for Elementary School Youngsters", Journal of School Health, 23:209, 1953.
- Brody, Grace F. "Relationship Between Maternal Attitudes and Behavior", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2:317-323, 1965.
- Bronfenbrenner, Urie. "The Split Level American Family", Saturday Review, October 7, 1967.
- Brown, George I., and Donald Gaynor. "Athletic Action as Creativity", The Journal of Creative Behavior, 1:155-162, Spring, 1967.
- Brown, Roger. Social Psychology. New York: The Free Press, 1965.
- Brown, Roscoe. "The Relationship Between Physical Performance and Personality in Elementary School Children", Contemporary Psychology of Sport, Edited by G.S. Kenyon. Chicago: The Athletic Institute, 1970.
- Brunner, Burton C. "Personality and Motivating Factors Influencing Adult Participation in Vigorous Physical Activity", Research Quarterly, 40:464-469, 1969.
- Bucher, Charles A., and Tim Cohane. "Little League Baseball Can Hurt Your Boy", Dimensions of Physical Education, Edited by C.A. Bucher and Myra Goldman. St. Louis: The C.V. Mosby Company, 1969.
- Bugental, J.F.T. Psychological Interviewing. (Revised Edition). Los Angeles: Psychological Service Associates, 1966.
- Buros, Oscar K. Test in Print. New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1961.
- Buros, Oscar K. The Third Mental Measurements Yearbook. New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1949.
- Buros, Oscar K. The Fourth Mental Measurements Yearbook. New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1953.
- Buros, Oscar K. The Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook. New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1959.
- Buros, Oscar K. The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook. New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1965.

- Butt, D.S. "Aggression, Neuroticism and Competence: Theoretical Models for the Study of Sports Motivation", Paper presented at the Third Canadian Psychomotor Skills and Sports Psychology Symposium, University of British Columbia, October 26, 1971.
- Campbell, W.G. Form and Style in Thesis Writing. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969.
- Carmichael, Leonard (ed.). Manual of Child Psychology. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1954.
- Carrol, J.E. "An Investigation into the Wastage in Athletics Amongst Young People Who Possess a High Degree of Physical Ability", British Journal of Physical Education, 1:9-11, 1970.
- Carter, Gerald C. and J.R. Shannon. "Adjustment and Personality Traits of Athletes and Non-Athletes", The School Review, 48:127-131, 1940.
- Castle, Ames. "Teamwork - The Case For and Against Small Fry Tournaments", Industrial Sports Journal, 13:25-26, 1952.
- Castle, Ames. "What Oakland Parents Say About Little League Ball", Industrial Sports Journal, 13:13-14, 1952.
- Cattell, Raymond B. "The Description of Personality: Basic Traits Resolved into Clusters", The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 38:476-506, 1943.
- Cattell, Raymond B. An Introduction to Personality Study. New York: Hutchinson's University Library, 1950.
- Cattell, Raymond B. The Structure of Human Personality. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1953.
- Cattell, Raymond B. Personality and Motivation: Structure and Measurement. New York: World Book Company, 1957.
- Cattell, Raymond B., and R.B. Porter. Handbook for the IPAT Children's Personality Questionnaire - the CPQ. Champaign: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1959.
- Cattell, R.B., and R.B. Porter. Manual for the Children's Personality Questionnaire - CPQ. Champaign: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1968.
- Church, R.M. "Applications of Behavior Theory to Social Psychology: Imitation and Competition", In Social Facilitation and Imitative Behaviour, Edited by R.A. Simmel et al. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1968.

- Clark, H.H., and Wilt Greene. "Relationship Between Personal Social Measures Applied to 10 Year Old Boys", Research Quarterly, 34:288-298, 1963.
- Cofer, Charles W., and W.R. Johnson. "Personality Dynamics in Relation to Exercise and Sports", In Science and Medicine of Exercise and Sports, Edited by W.R. Johnson. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1960.
- Coleman, James S. "Athletics in High School", Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science, 388: 33-43, 1961.
- Coleman, James S. The Adolescent Society, New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.
- Coogan, Dale. "Do Parents Expect Too Much", The Instructor, LXXVII: 18-22, 1968.
- Cooper, Lowell. "Athletics, Activity and Personality: A Review of the Literature", Research Quarterly, 40:17-22, 1969.
- Cratty, Bryant J. "Psychology of the Superior Athlete", Speech to the Canadian Association of Sports Sciences, Quebec City, October 31, 1970.
- Cronbach, Lee J. Essentials of Psychological Testing. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1960.
- Dawson, J.L.M. "Cultural and Physiological Influences Upon Spatial-Perceptual Processes in West Africa", (Part I, Part II), International Journal of Psychology, 2:3:171-185, 1967.
- Denton, L.R. "Perception of Parents as Related to Levels of Perceptual Differentiation", (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, 1967).
- Deutscher, Irwin. "Words and Deeds: Social Science and Social Policy", Journal of Social Problems, 13:235, Winter, 1966.
- Duthie, James H. "The Social Psychology of Sport", CAPHER Journal Supplement on Sports Psychology and Psycho-Motor Learning, 38:4:11-13, March/April, 1972.
- Dyk, R.B., and H.A. Witkin. "Family Experiences Related to the Development of Differentiation in Children", Child Development, 38:2:21-55, 1967.

- Edgington, Charles W. "Development of an Attitude Scale to Measure Attitudes of High School Freshman Boys Toward Physical Education", (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Colorado State College, 1965).
- Elkin, Frederick, The Family in Canada. Ottawa: The Vanier Institute of the Family, April, 1964.
- Eysenck, Hans J. The Scientific Study of Personality. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1952.
- Felker, Donald W. "Relationship Between Self Concept, Body Build, and Perception of Father's Interest in Sports in Boys", Research Quarterly, 39:3:513-517, 1968.
- Ferguson, George A. "A Note on the Kuder Richardson Formula", Educational and Psychological Measurement, 11:612-615, 1951.
- Ferguson, L.R., and E.E. Maccoby. "Interpersonal Correlates of Differential Abilities", Child Development, 37:549-571, 1966.
- Fishbein, Martin. Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.
- Foote, N.H. "Identification as the Basis for a Theory of Motivation", American Sociological Review, 16:14-21, 1951.
- Fox, E.E. "A Life Orientation Scale: Correlates of Biophilia and Necrophilia", (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, 1969).
- Friesen, David. "Academic-Athletic-Popularity Syndrome in the Canadian High School Society", Adolescence, 38-51, 1968.
- Frost, Reuben B. Psychological Concepts Applied to Physical Education and Coaching. Don Mills: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1971.
- Gaito, John. "Scale Classification and Statistics", In Readings in Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, Edited by E.F. Heermann and L.A. Braskamp. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Galfo, Armand J., and Earl Miller. Interpreting Educational Research. Iowa: William C. Brown Company, 1965.
- Gesell, Arnold, and Francis L. Ilg. The Child from Five to Ten. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishing, 1946.
- Good, C.V., and D.E. Scates. Methods of Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954.

- Gordon, C., and K.J. Gergen. The Self in Social Interaction. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968.
- Grossman, H.J., and N.H. Greenberg. "Psychosomatic Differences in Infancy: I. Autonomic Activity in the Newborn", Psychosomat. Med., 293-306, 1957.
- Groves, Barney Randolph. "An Investigation of Personality Changes Resulting from Participating in a College Intramural Program for Men", Dissertation Abstracts, 26:7145, June, 1966.
- Guilford, J.P. Personality. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.
- Guilford, J.P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1965.
- Hahn, Erwin. "Performance in Sports as a Criterion of Social Approach in School Classes: A Sociometric Investigation", Contemporary Psychology of Sport, Edited by G.S. Kenyon. Chicago: The Athletic Institute, 1970.
- Hall, Calvin S., and G. Lindzey (eds.). Theories of Personality. Toronto: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970.
- Hartup, W.W. "Peer Interaction and Social Organization", In Manual of Child Psychology, (Vol. 2), Edited by P.H. Mussen. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970.
- Hatt, P.K. "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation", In Class, Status and Power, Edited by R. Bendix and S.M. Lipset. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1953.
- Havighurst, R.J., M.Z. Robinson, and M. Dorr. "The Development of Ideal Self in Childhood and Adolescence", J. Educ. Res., 40:214-2-7, 1946.
- Heermann, Emil F., and Larry A. Braskamp (eds.). Readings in Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, 1970.
- Honzik, M.P. "Environmental Correlates of Mental Growth: Prediction from Family Setting at 21 Months", Child Development, 38:337-364, 1967.
- Hsu, Ise-Chi, and L.S. Feldt. "The Effect of Limitations on the Number of Criterion Score Values on the Significance Level of the F-Test", American Educational Research Journal, 6:515-526, 1969.
- Humphreys, Anthony, Arthur Traxler, and Robert North. Guidance Services. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1967.

- Hutton, Artley. "Are We Pushing Children Too Fast", Virginia Journal of Education, LX:14-16, 1967.
- Ikegami, Kinji. "Character and Personality Changes in the Athlete", Contemporary Psychology of Sport, Edited by G.S. Kenyon. Chicago: The Athletic Institute, 1970.
- Johnson, Clarence J. "Personality Traits Affected by High School Football as Measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey", Dissertation Abstracts, 27:658-A, September, 1966.
- Johnson, W.R., R.B. Fretz, and J.A. Johnson. "Changes in Self-Concepts During a Physical Development Program", Research Quarterly, 30:560-565, 1967.
- Johnson, Warren R., Daniel C. Hutton, and Granville B. Johnson Jr. "Personality Traits of Some Champion Athletes as Measured by Two Projective Tests: Rorschach and H-T-P", Research Quarterly, 25:484-485, 1954.
- Jones, E.J., and H.B. Gerard. Foundations of Social Psychology. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.
- Kane, John E. "Personality and Physical Abilities", Contemporary Psychology of Sport, Edited by G.S. Kenyon. Chicago: The Athletic Institute, 1970.
- Kagan, Jerome. "A Developmental Approach to Conceptual Growth", In Analysis of Concept Learning, Edited by H.J. Klausmaier. New York: Academic Press, 1966.
- Kenyon, Gerald S. Values Held for Physical Activity by Selected Urban Secondary School Students in Canada, Australia, England and the United States. United States Office of Education Contract S-376, February, 1968.
- Kenyon, Gerald S. "Sociological Considerations", Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 39:31-33, 1968.
- Kenyon, Gerald S. "The Use of Path Analysis in Sport Sociology with Special Reference to Involvement Socialization", (a working Paper presented at the International Workshop on the Sociology of Sport). Macolin, Switzerland, September 7-13, 1969.
- Kenyon, Gerald S. "The Social Psychology of Sport and Physical Activity", Contemporary Psychology of Sport, Edited by G.S. Kenyon. Chicago: The Athletic Institute, 1970.
- Kenyon, Gerald S. "Some Notes on Sociological Dimensions of Physical Recreation", Prepared for Recreation Research Seminar, Fitness and Amateur Sport Directorate, Ottawa, March 25, 1971.

- Kenyon, Gerald S., and Robert W. Schutz. "Patterns of Involvement in Sport: A Stochastic View", Contemporary Psychology of Sport, Edited by G.S. Kenyon. Chicago: The Athletic Institute, 1970.
- Keogh, Jack. "Relationship of Motor Ability and Athletic Participation in Certain Standardized Personality Measures", Research Quarterly, 30:438-445, 1959.
- Kessen, W., E.J. Williams, and J.P. Williams. "Selection of Test Response Measures in the Study of the Human Newborn", Child Development, 32:7-24, 1961.
- Kroll, Walter. "Sixteen Personality Factor Profiles of Collegiate Wrestlers", Research Quarterly, 38:49-57, 1967.
- Kroll, Walter, and William Crenshaw. "Multivariate Personality Profile Analysis of Four Athletic Groups", Contemporary Psychology of Sport, Edited by G.S. Kenyon. Chicago: The Athletic Institute, 1970.
- Kroll, Walter, and Kay H. Peterson. "Personality Factor Profiles of Collegiate Football Teams", Research Quarterly, 36:433-440, 1965.
- Kuhlen, Raymond G., and George C. Thompson (eds.). Psychological Studies of Human Development. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.
- Kurtzman, Kenneth. "A Study of School Attitudes, Peer Acceptance and Personality of Creative Adolescents", Exceptional Children, 34:157-162, 1967.
- LaKie, William L. "Personality Characteristics of Certain Groups of Intercollegiate Athletes", Research Quarterly, 33:566-573, 1962.
- Landers, Daniel M. "Sibling-Sex and Ordinal Position as Factors in Sport Participation", Paper presented at CAHPER Convention, Waterloo, 1971.
- La Place, John P. "Personality and Its Relationship to Success in Professional Baseball", Research Quarterly, 25:315-319, 1954.
- Larson, L.A. "Why Sports Participation", JOHPER, 35:36-37, 1964.
- Levy, D.M. Maternal Overprotection. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943.
- Likert, Rensis. "The Method of Constructing an Attitude Scale", In Readings in Attitude and Measurement, Edited by M. Fishbein. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.

- Lowman, C.L. "The Vulnerable Age", JOHPER, 18:635-636, 1947.
- Maddi, Salvatore R. (ed.). Personality Theories - A Comparative Analysis. Nobelton, Ontario: Irwin-Dorsey Limited, 1968.
- Malumphy, Theresa M. "Personality of Women Athletes in Inter-collegiate Competition", Research Quarterly, 39:610-620, 1968.
- Manis, J., and B. Meltzer. Symbolic Interaction: A Reader in Social Psychology. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1968.
- Maslow, Abraham H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1970.
- McAfee, R.A. "Sportsmanship Attitudes of 6th, 7th, and 8th Grade Boys", Research Quarterly, 26:120, 1955.
- McCue, Betty Foster. "Constructing an Instrument for Evaluating Attitudes Toward Intensive Competition in Team Games", Research Quarterly, 24:205-209, 1953.
- McGraw, L.W., and J.W. Talbert. "Sociometric Status and Athletic Ability of Junior High School Boys", Research Quarterly, 24:72-80, March, 1953.
- McNeil, Elton B. Human Socialization. Belmont: Brooks and Cole Publishing Company, 1969.
- Mead, G.H. Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Merriman, Burton J. "Relationship of Personality Traits to Motor Ability", Research Quarterly, 31:163-173, 1960.
- Moss, H.A., and J. Kagan. "Maternal Influence on Early I.Q.", Psychol. Rep., 4:655-661, 1958.
- Mosychuk, H. "Differential Home Environments and Mental Ability Patterns", (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, 1969).
- Munro, John. "A Proposed Sports Policy for Canadians", Report Presented by Minister of National Health and Welfare, March 20, 1970.
- Munro, John. "Sport Canada - Recreation Canada", Report Presented by Minister of National Health and Welfare to the National Advisory Council of Fitness and Amateur Sport, May 7, 1971.

- Murray, E.J. Motivation and Emotion. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.
- Mussen, Paul H. "Early Socialization: Learning and Identification", In New Directions in Psychology III, Edited by G. Mandler et al. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.
- Mussen, Paul H. (ed.). Manual of Child Psychology, (Vol. 1 and Vol. 2). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970.
- Mussen, Paul H., John J. Conger, and Jerome Kagan. Child Development and Personality. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1963.
- Mussen, Paul H., John J. Conger, and Jerome Kagan (eds.). Readings in Child Development and Personality. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1970.
- Nelson, Dale O. "Leadership in Sports", Research Quarterly, 37:268-275, 1966.
- Newman, E.N. "Personality Traits of Faster and Slower Competitive Swimmers", Research Quarterly, 39:1049-1053, 1968.
- Nettleton, B. "Physical Education in the Primary School", The Australian Journal of Physical Education, 13-21, March, 1965.
- Ogilvie, Bruce C. "Psychological Consistencies Within the Personality of High-Level Competitors", Journal of the American Medical Association, 205:11:156-162, 1968.
- Ogilvie, Bruce C. "What Is an Athlete", Paper Presented to AAHPER, Las Vegas, Nevada, March, 1967.
- Ogilvie, Bruce, and Keith W. Johnsgard. "The Personality of the Male Athlete", Paper Presented to the American Academy of Physical Education, Las Vegas, Nevada, April, 1967.
- Ogilvie, B.C., and T.A. Tutko. "What Is an Athlete?", Encyclopedia Sports Medicine, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1967.
- Parsons, David R. "Personality Traits of National Representative Swimmers - Canada, 1962", (unpublished Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, 1963).
- Peterson, James. "Investigating the Behavioral Consequences of Participation in Intramural Activities: A Changing Emphasis for Intramural Research", National Intramural Association, 21st Annual Conference Proceedings, U.S.A.F. Colorado, Illinois: Yeast Printing, pp. 75-78, 1970.

- Pitts, Carl E. (ed.). Operant Conditioning in the Classroom. New York: Crowell Company, 1971.
- Preston, Caroline E. "Self Perceptions Among Adolescents", Psychology in the Schools, IV:3:254, 1967.
- Pressy, Sidney L., and Raymond G. Kuhlen. Psychological Development Through the Life Span. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1957.
- Pyne, Francis F. "The Relationship of Measures of Self Concept, Motivation, and Ability to Success in Competitive Athletics", Dissertation Abstracts, 17:559, March, 1967.
- Rarick, G.L., and R. McKee. "A Study of Twenty Third-Grade Children Exhibiting Extreme Levels of Achievement on Tests of Motor Proficiency", Research Quarterly, 20:142-152, 1949.
- Reichert, John L. "Competitive Athletics for Pre Teen-age Children", In Background Readings for Physical Education, Edited by Ann Paterson and Edmund Hallberg. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.
- Rosen, Gerald and Alan Ross. "Relationship of Body Image to Self Concept", Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32:100-101, 1968.
- Rosenberg, Morris. Society and the Adolescent Self Image. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Ruffer, William A. "A Study of Extreme Physical Activity Groups of Young Men", Research Quarterly, 36:183-195, 1965.
- Rushall, Brent S. "Preliminary Personality Work with Swimmers", Coaches Bulletin No. 44, April, 1967.
- Rushall, Brent S. "Some Practical Applications of Personality Information to Athletics", Contemporary Psychology of Sport, Edited by G.S. Kenyon. Chicago: The Athletic Institute, 1970.
- Rushall, Brent S. "Operant Conditioning as a Realistic Method for Physical Education", CAPHER Journal Supplement on Sports Psychology and Psycho-Motor Learning, 38:4:31-33, March/April, 1972.
- Schachter, S. "Birth-Order and Sociometric Choice", J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., 68:453-456, 1964.
- Schendel, J. "Psychological Differences Between Athletes and Non-Participants in Athletics at Three Educational Levels", Research Quarterly, 36:52-67, 1965.

- Schendel, J. "The Psychological Characteristics of High School Athletes and Non-Participants in Athletics: A Three Year Longitudinal Study", Contemporary Psychology of Sport, Edited by G.S. Kenyon. Chicago: The Athletic Institute, 1970.
- Scott, Phebe. "Comparative Study of Attitudes Toward Athletic Competition in the Elementary School", (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1952).
- Secord, P.F., and C.W. Backman. Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1964.
- Seymour, E.W. "Comparative Study of Certain Behavior Characteristics of Participant and Non-Participant Boys in Little League Baseball", Research Quarterly, 27:338-346, 1956.
- Shaw, Marvin E., and Jack M. Wright. Scales for the Measurement of Attitude. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1967.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.
- Silvester, P.J. "Attitudes to Physical Education in the Primary School", Physical Education, 61:32-37, 1969.
- Singer, R.N. "Personality Differences Between and Within Baseball and Tennis Players", Research Quarterly, 40: 582-588, 1969.
- Skinner, B.F. The Technology of Teaching. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.
- Skinner, B.F. Beyond Freedom and Dignity. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971.
- Skubic, E. "Studies of Little League and Middle League Baseball", Research Quarterly, 27:97-110, 1956.
- Slovenko, R., and J.A. Knight (eds.). Motivations in Play, Games and Sports. Springfield: Charles Thomas, 1967.
- Slusher, Howard S. "Personality and Intelligence Characteristics of Selected High School Athletes and Non-Athletes", Research Quarterly, 35:539-545, 1964.
- Smith, Leon E. "Personality and Performance Research - New Theories and Directions Required", Quest, Monograph XIII:74-83, 1970.

- Smith, Michael D. "Aggression in Sport Toward a Role Approach", C.A.H.P.E.R. Journal, 37:2:22-25, January/February, 1971.
- Smith, Murray F. "Coaching Methods: Some Psychological Implications", Paper Presented at the International Symposium on the Art and Science of Coaching, Toronto, October 4, 1971.
- Smith, Murray F. "Adults in Kids' Sports", Paper Presented at the International Symposium on the Art and Science of Coaching, Toronto, Ontario, October 5, 1971.
- Snider, J.G., and C.E. Osgood. Semantic Differential Techniques - A Source Book. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969.
- Southwell, E.A., and M. Merbaum (eds.). Personality: Readings in Theory and Research. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1964.
- Sperling, A.P. "The Relationship between Personality Adjustment and Achievement in Physical Education Activities", Research Quarterly, 13:351-363, 1942.
- Squires, John Y. "Factors Influencing Attitudes of High School Senior Boys toward Physical Education", (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Springfield College, 1956).
- Thomas, Alexander, Stella Chess, and Herbert G. Birch. "The Origin of Personality", Scientific American, 102-109, August, 1970.
- Thomas, Walter L. The Thomas Self-Concept Values Test. Grand Rapid: Combined Motivation Education Systems, Inc., 1971.
- Thorpe, J. "A Study of Personality Variables among Successful Women Students and Teachers of Physical Education", Research Quarterly, 29:83-86, 1958.
- Tillman, Kenneth G. "The Relationship between Physical Fitness and Selected Personality Traits", Dissertation Abstracts, 25:276-277, July, 1964.
- Trager, Helen C., and Marian R. Yarrow. They Live What They Learn - Prejudice in Young Children. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1952.
- Tuddenham, R.D. "Studies in Reputation III - Correlates of Popularity among Elementary School Children", Journal of Educational Psychology, 42:257-276, 1951.
- Turner, R. "The Self-Conception in Social Interaction", In The Self in Social Interaction, Edited by C. Gordon and K.J. Gergen. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968.

- Tyler, E.J. "Psychological Dimensions of Physical Recreation", Paper Prepared for Recreation Research Seminar, Fitness and Amateur Sport Directorate, Ottawa, March 25, 1971.
- Vaz, Edmund W. "The Culture of Young Hockey Players: Some Initial Observations", Paper Presented at Canadian Association of Sports Sciences Symposium, October, 1970.
- Walker, Edward L. Conditioning and Instrumental Learning. Belmont, California: Brooks and Cole Publishing Company, 1967.
- Warburton, F.W., and J.E. Kane. "Personality Related to Sport and Physical Ability", In Readings in Physical Education, Edited by J.E. Kane. Physical Education Association, 1966.
- Ward, Eric. "Research in Socialization and Physical Activity", British Journal of Physical Education, 1:11-15, 1970.
- Welch, B.L. "The Generalization of Student's Problem when Several Different Population Variances are Involved", Biometrika, 34:28-35, 1947.
- Wepman, Joseph M., and Ralph W. Heine. Concepts of Personality. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1963.
- Werner, Alfred C. "Physical Education and the Development of Leadership Characteristics of Cadets at the U.S. Military Academy", (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Springfield, College, 1960).
- Werner, Alfred C., and Edward Gottheil. "Personality Development and Participation in Collegiate Athletics", Research Quarterly, 37:126-131, 1966.
- Whiting, H.T., and D.E. Stemberge. "Personality and the Persistent Non-Swimmer", Research Quarterly, 36:348-356, 1965.
- Wilkin, Bruce M. "The Effect of Interscholastic Competition of Seventh Grade Boys", Dissertation Abstracts, 25:277, July, 1964.
- Williamson, Robert C. Marriage and Family Relations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Witkin, H.A. et al. Psychological Differentiation Studies of Development. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.
- Witmer, H.L., and R. Kotinsky (eds.). Personality in the Making. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1952.

- Winch, Robert F., and Louis W. Goodman (eds.). Selected Studies in Marriage and the Family. Montreal: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.
- Winer, B.J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.
- Wolf, R.M. "The Identification and Measurement of Environmental Process Variables Related to Intelligence", (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1964).
- Wolff, P.H. "Observations on New-Born Infants", Psychosomat. Med., 21:110-118, 1959.
- Wylie, J.A. "Survey of 504 Families to Determine the Relationships Between Certain Factors and the Nature of the Family Recreation Program", Research Quarterly, 24:229-243, 1953.
- Wylie, Jane A. The Self Concept: A Critical Survey of Pertinent Research Literature. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963.
- Yarrow, Marian R., J.D. Campbell, and R.V. Burton. "Reliability of Maternal Retrospection: A Preliminary Report", Family Process, 3:207-218, 1964.

APPENDIX A

CHILDREN'S RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

I. CHILD SPORTS ENVIRONMENT INTERVIEW

A. Primary Sports Involvement of Child

1. Do you play any games or sports (like hockey, soccer, baseball, swimming, etc.)?

1a. After school? If yes, how often (how many times a week or a month)?

1	2	3	4	5
no, don't play sports after school	once or twice a month	once a week	two or three times a week	every day

1b. In the summer? If yes, how often?

1	2	3	4	5
no, don't play sports in summer	once or twice a month	once a week	two or three times a week	every day

2a. Are you going to play on a regular (organized league) team (i.e., hockey, soccer, baseball) or compete in any sports (i.e., swimming, gymnastics) this year?

1	2	3	4	5
no	don't think so	don't know	think so	yes

2b. If yes, what sport?

3a. Have you every played on any regular teams (or competed in any sports) before?

1	2	3	4	5
no	not really	don't know	yes, one year	yes, 2-3 years

3b. If yes, when and in what sport?

4a. Did anyone tell you about any teams you could go out for or ask you to go out for a team?

4b. If yes, who? If no, how did you find out that there were regular league teams for kids?

5. Do your best friends play a lot of sports?

1	2	3	4	5
no	don't think so, most don't, not that much	some do and some don't, don't know	most do, think so, usually	yes

B. Secondary Sports Involvement of Child

1a. Did you actually go to watch any live games or sporting events in the last year? (any sport) If yes, how often or how many times?

1	2	3	4	5
no, never went	don't think so	yes, once	two or three times	four times or more

1b. If yes, who did you go with and what did you see?

2a. Do you watch sports on television? If yes, how often per month or per week?

1	2	3	4	5
no, not really	once a month	twice a month	once or twice a week	three or four times a week or more, watch everything that comes on

2b. If yes, what do you watch?

3a. Do you root for or cheer for any sports team?

1	2	3	4	5
no	not really	don't know	yes, a little	yes, definitely, names teams

3b. If yes, which ones?

C. General Sports Information

1. What is your favourite hobby or sport or activity?

2a. What is your father's favourite hobby or sport or activity?

2b. What is your mother's favourite hobby or sport or activity?

3. Are sports important to you?

1	2	3	4	5
no	not really, don't think so	sometimes, a little, don't know	yes, think so, pretty well	yes (empha- tic)

4. Do you like to play sports?

1	2	3	4	5
no, not that much, not really	not usually, just a few, depends how I feel	some sports, sometimes, don't know	yes, most of the time	yes

5a. Do you like to watch sports?

1	2	3	4	5
no, not much, not really	just a few, not usually	some sports, sometimes	yes, most of the time	yes

5b. What do you like (or what don't you like) about watching sports?

6. What do you like best about sports?

7a. What do you like least about sports or what don't you like about sports?

7b. Is there anything (else) that bothers you about sports?

8a. What subject do you like best in school (i.e., math, art, reading, gym, science, etc.)?

8b. What subject do you like least in school?

9. Is there anything you like to do more than anything else? If yes, what?

1	2	3	4	5
non-sport activities i.e., sci- ence, play with chemis- try set, sleep	non-sport related i.e., go with family member, walk dog, see grandma, go someplace	no, not really	names sport related activity i.e., ride bike, hike, hunting, fishing	sports i.e., play hockey, skate, play football, skiing, swimming

10a. Is there anything you would like to see changed in sports to make them better?

10b. How could you change sports to make them more fun or make it so you would like them more?

11. What kinds of games, sports, activities, or hobbies would you like to have in school or in the community after school (or on the weekends)?

D. Child's Athletic Aspirations

1a. Would you like to be an athlete (or a member of a little league team)?

1	2	3	4	5
no	don't think so	don't know, maybe	yes, guess so	yes, (emphatic)

1b. Why would you or wouldn't you?

2a. Would you like to be good at sports? If yes, how good?

1	2	3	4	5
no	don't think so	don't know, medium, yes, average	yes, pretty good, fairly good	yes, very good, per- fect, real good, the best

2b. Why?

3a. Do you think you would like to be a star on the team?

1	2	3	4	5
no	don't think so	don't know	yes, guess so	yes, (emphatic)

3b. Why or why not?

4. If you could be anybody in the world, who would you want to be?

1	2	3	4	5
non-athlete		don't know, nobody, me		athlete

5. Non-Participant - Do you think you will ever want to go out for a sports team?

Participant - Do you think you will always want to go out for a sports team?

E. Child's Expectations from Participation

1a. Non-Participant - Do you think you would make the team (or be chosen to be on the team) this year, if you decided to go out for it?

Participant - Do you think you will make the team (or be chosen to be on the team) this year?

1	2	3	4	5
no	don't think so, probably not	don't know, maybe	yes, think so	yes, (emphatic)

1b. Non-Participant - If you thought you would surely make the team, would you go out for it?

2. How good do you think you could be in sports?

1	2	3	4	5
not too good	not too good, but not real bad	normal, average, medium, don't know, in between	pretty good, quite good, fairly good	very good, real good

3. Do you think the kids would like you better if you were really good at sports?

1	2	3	4	5
no	don't think so	don't know	yes, think so	yes, (emphatic)

4a. Do you think it would make your father or mother happy if you were really good at sports?

1	2	3	4	5
no	don't think so	don't know	think so	yes (emphatic)

4b. What makes you think that?

5. Non-Participant - What do you think it would be like for you if you went out for a team this year?

Participant - What do you think it will be like for you when you go out for the team this year?

1	2	3	4	5
wouldn't like it, be scared, wouldn't make it, probably not make it	not so good, don't know if I'd be any good	don't know, not sure, pretty cold	pretty fun, pretty good	fun, real good, easy, I'll be good

F. Child's Perception of Parental Expectations

1. Do you think your father or mother would like you to take part in sports?

1	2	3	4	5
no	don't think so	don't know, want me to do what I want	think so	yes

2a. Is there anyone else who you like a lot who would like you to take part in sports?

1	2	3	4	5
no	don't think so	don't know	think so	yes

2b. If yes, who?

3. Do you think that either your father or mother expect you to be an athlete or expect you to take part in sports?

1	2	3	4	5
no	don't think so	don't know, not sure	yes, think so	yes, (emphatic)

II. THE THOMAS SELF CONCEPT VALUES TEST

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Keying Weights</u>
Factor 1: Happiness	Happy - Sad	+ -
Factor 2: Size	Big - Little	+ -
Factor 3: Sociability	Like to play with other kids - Not like to play with other kids	+ -
Factor 4: Ability	Smart - Not very smart	+ -
Factor 5: Sharing	Like other kids to play with his things - Not like other kids to play with his things	+ -
Factor 6: Male Accpetance	Like to be with men - Not like to be with men	+ -
Factor 7: Fear (of things)	Scared of a lot of things - Not scared of a lot of things	- +
Factor 8: Fear (of people)	Scared of a lot of people - Not scared of a lot of things	- +
Factor 9: Strength	Strong - Weak	+ -
Factor 10: Cleanliness	Clean - Dirty	+ -
Factor 11: Health	Well (healthy) - Sick	+ -
Factor 12: Attractiveness	Goodlooking - Not good-looking	+ -
Factor 13: Material	Want a lot of things - Not want a lot of things	- +
Factor 14: Independence	Like to do what others say - Not like to do what others say	+ -

In all there are fourteen value scores and five self concept scores derived from the test. The fourteen value scores may range from raw scores of -4 to +4. There are four referent

self concept scores:

1. self-as-subject score
2. self-as-object score - Mother
3. self-as-object score - Teacher
4. self-as-object score - Other Kids.

Each of the four referent self concept raw scores may range from -14 to +14. The total Self Concept score is a sum of the self-as-subject score and the three self-as-object scores. The total self concept score may range from -56 to +56. In order to compare individuals among factors, all the self concept scores are converted to standard scores. The common scale chosen is a T-scale which has a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10.

Item Analysis. Item analysis was conducted to ascertain the overall discriminating ability of each item and the relationship of each item to the remaining items in the scale to which it is keyed. One hundred and twenty-six item scale coefficients were derived, ranging from a low of .10 to .93. Only three items indicated a very slight but noticeable relationship with the rest of the items in the scale. All of the other items were significantly related to the scale in which they were keyed, with most items very strongly so. In terms of item-scale data the various scales and total scale are internally consistent, thereby, evidencing a type of reliability.

1. Test-Retest Stability. A Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was calculated on each of nineteen pairs of test-retest score distributions. The derived co-

efficients ranged from a low of .34 on health self-value to a high of .93 on the sharing self-value. The test-retest coefficient for the total score was .78. The median coefficient for the distribution was .75. All the derived coefficients were significant at the .05 level of confidence where the critical value was .345. The above data support the conclusion of temporal stability (fourteen days) among the nineteen scales of the Thomas Self Concept Values Test.

2. Internal Consistency Reliability. The Thomas Self Concept Values Test yields five self concept scores (four referents and the total score). If the four referent sub-scales are related then a form of total test reliability is established. The four score distributions (self, mother, teacher, peers) were subjected to analysis with a Pearson product moment correlation. The mean of the distribution of N's was .7306. The degree of sub-scale relationship is an indication of the instrument's internal consistency.

Internal Consistency Among the Four Self Concept Sub-Scales

Self	vs. Mother	.7736
Self	vs. Teacher	.6981
Self	vs. Peer	.6010
Mother	vs. Teacher	.7951
Mother	vs. Peer	.7231

3. Concurrent Validity. In an attempt to find existing populations that were believed to be significantly different on each of the items, two groups were chosen: highly privileged

and very underprivileged. Highly privileged children would supposedly have higher total self concept scores than would very underprivileged children. Highly privileged children came from homes where both mother and father were college graduates, father was professional, income was over \$20,000. Very underprivileged children were from homes where neither mother nor father finished high school, and father was unskilled (if employed).

Fourteen of the nineteen criterion group analyses for mean difference did exist at the .05 level of confidence. A t-test for mean difference was calculated in each case. All of these fourteen significant differences indicated the highly privileged group perceived themselves more positively than the very underprivileged group.

The four referent scores and the total self concept score were very substantial indicators of difference between the two criterion groups (all well beyond .05 level).

The questions which comprise the Thomas Self Concept Test were administered through the use of an interview with each child. The actual interview questions follow directly.

THOMAS SELF CONCEPT VALUES TEST - INTERVIEW

A-Self

- 1a. Is Charlie Brown (child's name) Happy or Sad?
- 2a. Is CB Big or Little?
- 3a. Does CB like to play with the other kids or not like to play with the other kids?
- 4a. Is CB Smart or Not Very Smart?
- 5a. Does CB like other kids to play with his things or not like other kids to play with his things?
- 6a. Does CB like to be with men or not like to be with men?
- 7a. Is CB scared of a lot of things or not scared of a lot of things?
- 8a. Is CB scared of a lot of people or not scared of a lot of people?
- 9a. Is CB Strong or Weak?
- 10a. Is CB Clean or Dirty?
- 11a. Is CB Well (healthy) or Sick?
- 12a. Is CB good looking or not good looking?
- 13a. Does CB want a lot of things or not want a lot of things?
- 14a. Does CB like to do what others say or not like to do what others say?
- 15a.* Is CB Good at Sports or Not Very Good at Sports?

B-Mother

- 1b. Does CB's mother think he is Happy or Sad?
- 2b. Does CB's mother think he is Big or Little?

* Adaptation by researcher for "Perception of Sports Ability".

- 3b. Does CB's mother think he likes to play with the other kids or think he doesn't like to play with the other kids?
- 4b. Does CB's mother think he is Smart or Not Very Smart?
- 5b. Does CB's mother think he likes other kids to play with his things or that he does not like other kids to play with his things?
- 6b. Does CB's mother think he likes to be with men or that he doesn't like to be with men?
- 7b. Does CB's mother think he is scared of a lot of things or not scared of a lot of things?
- 8b. Does CB's mother think he is scared of a lot of people or not scared of a lot of people?
- 9b. Does CB's mother think he is Strong or Weak?
- 10b. Does CB's mother think he is Clean or Dirty?
- 11b. Does CB's mother think he is Well (healthy) or Sick?
- 12b. Does CB's mother think he is good looking or not good looking?
- 13b. Does CB's mother think he wants a lot of things or does not want a lot of things?
- 14b. Does CB's mother think he likes to do what others say or not like to do what others say?
- 15b.* Does CB's mother think he is good at sports or not very good at sports?

C-Teacher

- 1c. Does CB's teacher think he is Happy or Sad?
- 2c. Does CB's teacher think he is Big or Little?
- 3c. Does CB's teacher think he likes to play with the other kids or think he doesn't like to play with the other kids?
- 4c. Does CB's teacher think he is Smart or Not Very Smart?

* Adaptation by researcher for "Perception of Sports Ability".

- 5c. Does CB's teacher think he likes other kids to play with his things or that he does not like other kids to play with his things?
- 6c. Does CB's teacher think he likes to be with men or that he doesn't like to be with men?
- 7c. Does CB's teacher think he is scared of a lot of things or not scared of a lot of things?
- 8c. Does CB's teacher think he is scared of a lot of people or not scared of a lot of people?
- 9c. Does CB's teacher think he is Strong or Weak?
- 10c. Does CB's teacher think he is Clean or Dirty?
- 11c. Does CB's teacher think he is Well (healthy) or Sick?
- 12c. Does CB's teacher think he is good looking or not good looking?
- 13c. Does CB's teacher think he wants a lot of things or does not want a lot of things?
- 14c. Does CB's teacher think he likes to do what others say or not like to do what others say?
- 15c.* Does CB's teacher think he is good at sports or not very good at sports.

D-Other Kids

- 1d. Do the other kids in the class think CB is Happy or Sad?
- 2d. Do the other kids in the class think CB is Big or Little?
- 3d. Do the other kids in the class think CB likes to play with them or that he does not like to play with them?
- 4d. Do the other kids in the class think CB is Smart or Not Very Smart?
- 5d. Do the other kids in the class think that CB likes them to play with his things or that he does not like them to play with his things?

* Adaptation by researcher.

- 6d. Does the other kids in the class think that CB likes to be with men or that he does not like to be with men?
- 7d. Do the other kids in the class think that CB is scared of a lot of things or not scared of a lot of things?
- 8d. Do the other kids in the class think that CB is scared of a lot of people or not scared of a lot of people?
- 9d. Do the other kids in the class think CB is Strong or Weak?
- 10d. Do the other kids in the class think CB is Clean or Dirty?
- 11d. Do the other kids in the class think CB is Well (healthy) or Sick?
- 12d. Do the other kids in the class think CB is good looking or not good looking?
- 13d. Do the other kids in the class think that CB wants a lot of things or that he does not want a lot of things?
- 14d. Do the other kids in the class think that CB likes to do what others say or that he does not like to do what others say?
- 15d.* Do the other kids in the class think that CB is good at sports or not very good at sports?

* Adaptation by researcher.

III. SRA INVENTORY OF CHILDREN'S INTERESTS

WHAT I LIKE TO DO

Active Play

Would you like to...	NO	?	YES
1. Play baseball.....	_____	_____	_____
2. Go hunting.....	_____	_____	_____
3. Play cowboys, or space men, or cops and robbers.....	_____	_____	_____
4. Play tennis.....	_____	_____	_____
5. Go swimming.....	_____	_____	_____
6. Play tug-of-war.....	_____	_____	_____
7. Pitch horseshoes.....	_____	_____	_____
8. Play kick-ball or dodge-ball.....	_____	_____	_____
9. Play follow-the-leader.....	_____	_____	_____
10. Fly a kite.....	_____	_____	_____
11. Flip jackknives.....	_____	_____	_____
12. Go fishing.....	_____	_____	_____
13. Play hockey.....	_____	_____	_____
14. Play hopscotch or "sky-blue".....	_____	_____	_____
15. Play volleyball.....	_____	_____	_____
	NO	?	YES
16. Walk on stilts.....	_____	_____	_____
17. Do folk dancing.....	_____	_____	_____
18. Play football.....	_____	_____	_____
19. Roller skate.....	_____	_____	_____
20. Play basketball.....	_____	_____	_____

	NO	?	YES
21. Go on hikes.....	_____	_____	_____
22. Box or wrestle.....	_____	_____	_____
23. Do marching.....	_____	_____	_____
24. Go camping.....	_____	_____	_____
25. Ride horseback.....	_____	_____	_____
26. Do stunts on bars or on a mat.....	_____	_____	_____
27. Explore caves.....	_____	_____	_____
28. Play ping-pong.....	_____	_____	_____
29. Climb trees.....	_____	_____	_____
30. Shoot targets with a bow and arrow or a BB gun.....	_____	_____	_____
31. Go bike riding.....	_____	_____	_____
32. Build things out of snow.....	_____	_____	_____
33. Play tag.....	_____	_____	_____
34. Play hide-and-seek.....	_____	_____	_____
35. Do relay racing.....	_____	_____	_____
36. Go sledding in the snow.....	_____	_____	_____
37. Throw rocks or darts at a target.....	_____	_____	_____
38. Play catch.....	_____	_____	_____
39. Play jumping-rope games.....	_____	_____	_____
40. Ice skate.....	_____	_____	_____

WHAT I LIKE TO DO

Quiet Play

Would you like to...	NO	?	YES
1. Collect pictures - such as baseball players, or airplanes.....	_____	_____	_____
2. Perform magic tricks.....	_____	_____	_____
3. Play table games like "Monopoly".....	_____	_____	_____
4. Read poems.....	_____	_____	_____
5. Be in a play or a show.....	_____	_____	_____
6. Play checkers.....	_____	_____	_____
7. Play jacks or shoot marbles.....	_____	_____	_____
8. Write letters to your friends and relatives..	_____	_____	_____
9. Belong to a club.....	_____	_____	_____
10. Listen to sports on the radio - or watch sports on TV.....	_____	_____	_____
11. Make up stories.....	_____	_____	_____
12. Play card games.....	_____	_____	_____
13. Play "dress-up".....	_____	_____	_____
14. Play house or play school.....	_____	_____	_____
15. Collect stamps or coins.....	_____	_____	_____
	NO	?	YES
16. Play guessing games.....	_____	_____	_____
17. Play with a yo-yo.....	_____	_____	_____
18. Take care of a pet animal.....	_____	_____	_____
19. Read stories.....	_____	_____	_____
20. Do card tricks.....	_____	_____	_____
21. Play cards by yourself.....	_____	_____	_____

	NO	?	YES
22. Play with a model train (automatic train set).....	_____	_____	_____
23. Work jigsaw puzzles.....	_____	_____	_____
24. Build things with an "Erector Set" (Meccanno).....	_____	_____	_____
25. Visit your parent's friends.....	_____	_____	_____
26. Play with paper dolls.....	_____	_____	_____
27. Listen to someone read stories.....	_____	_____	_____
28. Listen to stories on the radio - or watch stories on TV.....	_____	_____	_____
29. Go to movies.....	_____	_____	_____
30. Write poems.....	_____	_____	_____
31. Work crossword puzzles.....	_____	_____	_____
32. Make a scrapbook.....	_____	_____	_____
33. Go to the library.....	_____	_____	_____

IV. CHILDREN'S PERSONALITY QUESTIONNAIRE

General Information. There are two forms of the CPQ, A and B, each divided into two parts (A_1 , A_2 and B_1 , B_2). Each part can be given in a class period or approximately 50 minutes. For the purposes of this study, Form A (parts A_1 and A_2) was utilized. Raw scores were used for determining any significant differences between groups, as is recommended in the CPQ Handbook.

The vocabulary is carefully controlled but was necessarily somewhat difficult when used with below average third grade children and retarded readers. With eight-year old children, and with nine-year old poor readers, the researcher read the entire test aloud to the children. Answers were marked directly in the question booklet due to the fact that young children get confused using separate answer sheets.

Test Design. 1. Each item which is allowed to contribute to any given factor score was shown empirically, by factor analysis, to be significantly loaded in (correlated with) that factor.

2. At the same time wherever possible, items were chosen that acted as mutual "suppressors" for other common factors, not wanted in the given scale.

3. Wherever feasible, items were chosen which loaded a factor, but which, from content, would not appear to the child to do so.

4. The psychological identity of each factor was esta-

blished from the correlation of the questionnaire factor score with behavior rating (criterion) factors.

5. Each factor was balanced for "response sets".

6. Items (from highest to lowest loaded) were split symmetrically to ensure factor loading equivalence of the A and B scales.

7. Items were arranged cyclically in terms of factors.

8. The aim was the highest scale reliability compatible with a total single form length which could be administered in a 50 minute class period.

Reliability and Validity. The dependability coefficient (Test-retest coefficient, without an interval) for the 14 traits on the full length test ranged from .63 to .87. The stability coefficient (Test-retest coefficient, after an interval) for the 14 traits on the full length test ranged from .52 to .83.

The essential validity of a factor scale is determined by the extent to which the scale correlates with the pure factor which it claims to measure. This value is its construct or concept validity. Concept validity calculated by the multiple-r of the ten items in each factor (with the pure factors) ranged from .53 to .84.

APPENDIX B

PARENTS' RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

I. FAMILY SPORTS ENVIRONMENT INTERVIEW

A. Primary Sports Involvement of Family

1. Were either you or your husband ever athletes or active in sports?

1	2	3	4	5
no, never active in sports at all	no, neither were athletes, did very little, minimum	one or both were a little active, i.e., recreational or leisure activities	yes, one athlete, member of competitive team (i.e., high school, college)	yes, both were athletes, both members of competitive teams

2. Do you or your husband actually take part in any sports, games or physical activities:

a. In the summer? (If yes, how often?)

1	2	3	4	5
no, never	seldom, once a month or less	sometimes, two or four times a month, once every week or two	often, two to three times a week	regularly, nearly every day, four times a week or more, i.e., tennis, golf, swimming, etc.

b. In the winter? (If yes, how often?)

1	2	3	4	5
no, never	seldom, once a month or less	sometimes, two to four times a month	often, two to three times a week	regularly, nearly every day, four times a week or more, i.e., skating, skiing, curling, etc.

3. Are any other children in your family (besides one in study) involved in sports? If yes, to what extent?

1	2	3	4	5
no	not really	a little involved, recreational sports, intramurals, lessons, no other kids	yes, involved on a team or train on a regular basis	yes, all involved extensively, in several sports, i.e., on organized team(s), also take lessons

4. Do you get together as a family to partake in any activities? (summer or winter, weekends or weekdays) (score physically active get togethers only).

1	2	3	4	5
no sports	few of any kind, one activity, i.e., walking in country	sometimes, two activities, i.e., skating, camping	quite a few activities, three to four activities, i.e., swimming, hiking, skiing, skating	many activities, numerous sports, everything we do, five or more activities

5. Do you belong to any sports clubs, YMCA, or recreation centers excluding the community league?

1	2	3	4	5
no		did belong, will join		yes

B. Secondary Sports Involvement of Family

1. Do you or your husband ever attend athletic events of any kind as spectators? (i.e., actually go to live games). If yes, how often in the last year? (To score: Total number of pro, semi-pro, university games attended).

1	2	3	4	5
no, never	seldom, not too often, once	two to four times	five to six times	seven times or more, have season tickets, never miss a game

2. Do you or your husband watch sports or physical activities on television? If yes, how often? (per month or week)

1	2	3	4	5
no	less than once a month, not too often	once or twice a month, sometimes, once every two weeks	once or twice a week, i.e., usually hockey or football every week	three or four times a week, everything that is on, don't miss anything, very often

3a. Does your husband read about sports in the newspaper?
If yes, how often? (every day)?

1	2	3	4	5
no	seldom, less than once a month, doubt- ful	sometimes, once or twice a month	fairly regu- larly, two or three times a week	yes, always, every day

3b. Does he ever turn directly to the sports section? If yes,
how often?

1	2	3	4	5
no	seldom, less than once a month, doubt- ful	sometimes, once or twice a month	fairly regu- larly, two or three times a week	yes, always, every day

4a. Do you subscribe to any sports magazines or own any books
on sports?

1	2	3	4	5
no, nothing on sports	don't think so	one book or one sports magazine, don't know	two or three books or two or three sports maga- zines	yes, several books, four or more books, or subscrip- tion to sports magazine

4b. Do you or your husband ever read about sports in magazines
or books? If yes, how often?

1	2	3	4	5
no	less than once a month, seldom	sometimes, once or twice a month	often, once or twice a week, if it is in a maga- zine will read it	regularly, three to four times a week, whenever it would appear, very interested in anything on sports, pick up sports illustrated.

5. Do you or your husband have any allegiance to (or root
for) any teams?

1	2	3	4	5
no	not really	don't know	yes, a little	yes, definitely, names teams

C. Parental Expectations and Athletic Aspirations for Child

1. Do you have any expectations of your boy in terms of him participating or not participating in sports?

1	2	3	4	5
expect that he won't participate, do not expect him to participate	no definite expectations, up to him	don't know, perhaps	most likely, probably expect him to be involved	yes, expect him to participate, take it for granted he will

- 2a. Would you like your son to participate in sports?

1	2	3	4	5
no	don't care, no definite aspirations	neutral, up to the boy	yes, if he's interested, yes, I guess so (qualified yes)	very much so, yes definitely

- 2b. Why would you like him to participate or why wouldn't you like him to participate? (Information).

3. Do you have any expectations in terms of the level he may attain in sports (or as an athlete)?

1	2	3	4	5
do not really expect him to participate	no expectations, just for fun, level not important, up to him	average, on par with peers, reasonably well	go as far as he can, reach potential (university athlete or scholarship athlete)	outstanding athlete, professional or national calibre

4. What level would you like him to attain as an athlete (if you had your choice)?

1	2	3	4	5
would not really like him to participate	no aspirations level not important, just enjoy it, have fun, level up to him	do reasonably well, average level, on par with peers, good enough to be on team	reach potential do his best, (university athlete or scholarship athlete)	the best professional, NHL, etc.

5. Is your boy involved in (or training for) any activities outside the regular school physical education program? If yes, in what and how often?

1	2	3	4	5
no	seldom, once a month or less	sometimes, once every week or two, i.e., swim lessons	regularly, two or three times a week	extensively, almost every day, i.e., hockey, swimm- ing, skiing, soccer

D. Encouragement for Participation

- 1a. Have you or your husband encouraged your son to get involved in sports?

1	2	3	4	5
no	not really	neutral, neither encourage, nor discourage, his choice	yes	very much so, yes, definitely, yes (emphatic)

- 1b. If you have encouraged him, in what particular way did you encourage him? (Information).

- 2a. Is there anyone else who your son looks up to (besides you or your husband) who may have encouraged him to participate?

1	2	3	4	5
no	don't think so	don't know, maybe	think so	yes

- 2b. If yes, who may have encouraged him?

3. Do you think that over the years you have encouraged quiet play (like checkers, collections and puzzles) or active play requiring a lot of energy (like skating, swimming, and bicycling)?

1	2	3	4	5
quiet play	both but mostly quiet	both or neither, in the middle, don't know	both but mostly active	active play

4. Do your husband and son ever participate together in sport related activities? (i.e., playing catch) If yes, how often? (most frequent time: summer or winter).

1	2	3	4	5
no, very rarely	seldom, once or twice a month	sometimes, once or twice a week (i.e., summer, weekends)	often three to four times a week	very fre- quently, five times or more per week

- 5a. What types of gifts (of any sort) did your boy get for the last two or three birthdays and Christmases?

1	2	3	4	5
no sports equip- ment or gifts	one to two sports items, mostly toys, books, mechanical gifts	three to four sports items	five to six sports items, mostly sports gifts	seven or more sports items, al- most exten- sively sports items

- 5b. What sports equipment does your boy have? (To score count number of sports items mentioned).

1	2	3	4	5
doesn't have any	one or two items	three to four items, i.e., bat, skates, ball, glove	five to six items, i.e., football, soccer ball, hockey stick etc.	seven or more sports items, near- ly every- thing, i.e., hockey equip- ment, ski equip, foot- ball equip, baseball equip, ten- nis equip, etc., etc.

6. Do you or your husband ever watch your boy play or practice sport related activities? If yes, how often?

1	2	3	4	5
no	not really, once a month, sel- dom, doesn't do much	once every two weeks, sometimes but not that often, watch when he plays but does not play often	frequently once or twice a week, most games	always, never miss a game, go to some practices too, three times a week or more, all the time, every time

7. Do you or your husband ever have any discussions with your boy concerning sports? If yes, how often?

1	2	3	4	5
no	very seldom, can't remem- ber when	once in a while, every month or two	sometimes, once every two to four weeks	quite often, every week, all the time, i.e., after every game, once or twice a week

E. General Sports Information

1. Is there anything that you personally like about sports? If yes, what is it that you like or what is the attraction for you?
2. Is there anything that you dislike about sports, or organized sports, especially for kids?
3. Would you rather that your son be outstanding in one sport or average in many? (for participants only)
4. What types of activities would you like to see available in the community? (for children and parents)?
5. Is there anything you would like to see changed in sports to make them better or to make it a better experience for the kids?

II. DEPENDENCY FOSTERING INTERVIEW

A. Mosychuk's Dependency Fostering-Overprotective Home Environment Interview

1.
 - a. Did you find that during your child's preschool years you frequently had to settle arguments or fights and restore order among the neighborhood youngsters?
 - b. Did you frequently join in play with the children in their preschool years? Was this to guide them or to keep order?
 - c. In the children's preschool years did you frequently observe your own and neighborhood children in play? What was your main purpose in observing them?
 - d. Do you think that children, in their preschool years, playing with other boys and girls, always require adult supervision or should they be left to solve their own problems and do their own planning?
2.
 - a. Did your boy in his preschool years play more in his own yard or at the neighbors?
 - b. Did you make arrangements and provide facilities in your home or yard which encouraged your boy and his friends to play at your place rather than elsewhere?
 - c. Were there, or are there still any youngsters in the neighborhood with whom you felt your boy should not play?
3.
 - a. Where did you keep things such as scissors, knives and other sharp objects when the boy was young? Were these special places?
 - b. Did you caution or warn him regularly about stairways, stoves, knives, traffic, strangers and other dangerous objects or situations?
4.
 - a. At what age did you permit or will you permit your boy to take his bicycle to school?
 - b. At what age did the boy go to the community playground with other children?
 - c. At what age did you allow or will you allow your boy to go to friends, relatives or camp for periods of more than two whole days? (Excluding times when you had to be separated from him.)

- d. At what age did you allow him or will you allow him to go on hikes along the river or on treasure hunts with other boys?
- 5.
- a. What action do you take when your boy tells "dirty" stories or uses swear words which he picked up in the neighborhood playground or at school?
 - b. What do you or would you do if you noticed him reading magazines or books with "dirty" stories or swear words?
 - c. Do you have any books in the home which you do not wish your boy to read?
 - d. Did you approve of your boy watching horror or mystery movies when he was very young (preschool years)?
- 6.
- a. If you or your husband buy your boy a shirt, or some other clothing and he does not like it do you take it back or do you usually convince him to keep it?
 - b. How is the decision made as to which clothes the boy wears to school every day?
- 7.
- a. What are some specific tasks (things) that he wishes to do but you feel that he would not do well enough because he is too young?
 - b. What are some tasks (things) that he should be doing well but he still doesn't?
 - c. Do you let him try them regardless or do you usually do them for him?
- 8.
- a. Does your boy get an allowance?
 - b. If not, does he get any spending money?
 - c. What is he permitted to spend this money or allowance on?
 - d. If his money or allowance runs out what happens then?

S. Dependency Fostering-Overprotection Scoring Key

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. none							
2. none							
3. no own pleasure			just to play see how play	occasional enjoy self be certain they don't fight	yes guide		often keep order be certain they are safe
4. no supervision				some supervision			always supervised
5a. neighbors				both			own
5. no				yes, facilities			yes, spec. arrangements yes
6. no							special place designed for child's safety emphatic always
7a. usual place, always there							
8. sometimes				yes			
9a. 5 years			6	no bicycle, 7	8	9	greater than 10
10. 3			5	6	7	8	greater than 10
11. 3			5	6	7	8	greater than 10
12. 5			7	8		9	greater than 10
13a. explain							
14. allow to read			ignore	get angry explain	scold get angry	scold	punish punish yes no
15. no				didn't matter			
16. yes							
17a. take back							
18. boy's own				willing or con- vince to keep boy's, mother check			must keep mother puts out
19. no tasks							
20. no tasks				one task one task			variety of tasks variety of tasks do for him
21. get him to do							
22a. yes				irregularly			no
23. yes				earns			no
24. anything he wishes				must save some			must ask
25. gets more							must wait

III. EARLY ACTIVITY PATTERN QUESTIONNAIRE (EAPQ)

Thinking back through the years, beginning when your son was a baby, how would you describe his level of activity? (1 indicates that he highly resembles the description on the left, 5 indicates that he highly resembles the description on the right, 3 indicates in between.) Circle the number which you feel best describes his activity level at the various age levels.

1. At 2 months:

Seldom moved in sleep, when diaper changing or being dressed	1	2	3	4	5	Moved often in sleep, when dia- per changing or being dressed
--	---	---	---	---	---	--

2. At 6 months:

Splashed in bath, bounced in crib	1	2	3	4	5	Passive in bath, played quietly in crib
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

3. At 1 year:

Walked rapidly, ate eagerly, climbed into everything	1	2	3	4	5	Did not walk or walked slowly
--	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------------------

4. At 2 years:

Enjoyed active play such as climbing furniture and explor- ing	1	2	3	4	5	Enjoyed quiet play such as play- ing with puzzles
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

5. At 5 years:

Seldom ran, sat quietly at meals and on long auto rides	1	2	3	4	5	Always ran, was restless on long auto rides
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

6. At 7 years:

Engaged in active games and sports (played ball, etc.) with kids	1	2	3	4	5	Preferred quiet activities such as checkers, read- ing, listening to records, watching television
---	---	---	---	---	---	--

IV. EARLY ACTIVITY PATTERN INTERVIEW (EAPI)

1. In your own words, how would you describe your son's level of activity when he was a baby? (Was he an active baby or quiet baby?)

1	2	3	4	5
quiet, mild, low activity	fairly quiet	in between average	fairly active	very active

2. During early childhood, did he show a preference for active play requiring a great deal of energy such as running and jumping and pounding or quiet play such as collecting things, figuring out puzzles, colouring and making models?

1	2	3	4	5
quiet play	mostly quiet play	in between both	mostly active play	active play

3. During early childhood did he play primarily by himself, with one or two pals, or with a group?

1	2	3	4	5
by himself	one person primarily	one or two pals	two or three (usually three)	with a group

V. PRESENT ACTIVITY PATTERN QUESTIONNAIRE (PAPQ)

How would you describe your son's present activity patterns? Circle the number which you feel best describes his present activity. (1 indicates that he highly resembles the description on the left, 5 indicates that he highly resembles the description on the right, 3 indicates in between.)

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1. Avoids physical adventure and physical activity | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Loves physical adventure and physical activity |
| 2. Very competitive and aggressive, likes competitive games | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Neither competitive nor aggressive, avoids competitive games |
| 3. Prefers active games that require a great deal of energy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Prefers quiet games requiring little physical exertion |
| 4. Prefers to play alone | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Prefers to play with a group |
| 5. Little or no regard for safety rules, takes many chances or risks (daredevil) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | High regard for safety rules, takes few or no risks or chances |
| 6. Seldom eager to try something new or different | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Always eager to try something new or different |

VI. PRESENT ACTIVITY PATTERNS INTERVIEW (PAPI)

1. Is your son more or less mature in physical appearance than other boys his own age?

1	2	3	4	5
less	a little less	about the same, average	a little more	more

2. How would you rate your boy as to the amount of physical activity he gets compared with other boys his own age?

1	2	3	4	5
much less active	a little less active	about the same, ave- rage	a little more active	much more active, or he's more active

3. Would you say that your son has always been active or always been quiet or have his activity patterns changed? (If changed, note direction.)

1	2	3	4	5
always quiet, always mild	always fairly quiet	in between, did both, changed	always fairly active	always active

4. What were some of your boy's keen interests of any kind in the last year or so? (i.e., games, hobbies, sports, collections, etc.)

1	2	3	4	5
no physi- cally active interests, collections	low on phy- sically active in- terests, more quiet than active	in between some active and some quiet in- terests, equal interest in both	fairly keen on physical activi- ties, more active than quiet	high on physical activi- ties, always playing sports all year

VII. ATTITUDES ABOUT SPORTS

Directions

Express your feelings about sports by circling the position on the scale which best represents the direction and intensity of your feelings. 1 indicates that sports highly resemble the description on the left, 7 indicates that sports highly resemble the description on the right, 4 indicates in between. If any of the words are unrelated to sports or have no meaning to you in a sports context, also circle 4.

SPORTS

1. good	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	bad
2. worthless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	worthwhile
3. pleasant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unpleasant
4. sour	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	sweet
5. nice	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	awful
6. sad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	happy
7. clean	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	dirty
8. relaxed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	tense

VIII. GENERAL INFORMATION - PARENTS

1. Name _____
2. Address _____
3. Phone Number _____
4. Boy's Name (in study) _____
5. How old is he? _____ Years
_____ Months
6. How many brothers and sisters does he have? _____ brothers
_____ sisters
7. How many brothers and sisters are older than him? _____ brothers
_____ sisters
8. Do you ever use a language other than English in your home? _____
9. About how long have you lived in Canada? _____
10. Mark your husband's highest educational level with an H.
Mark yours with a W.
- _____ 1. graduate or professional training after first university degree
_____ 2. college or university degree
_____ 3. some college training (one year or more)
_____ 4. vocational training after high school
_____ 5. high school graduate
_____ 6. some high school (completed grade 10 or 11)
_____ 7. junior high school (completed grade 7, 8, or 9)
_____ 8. less than seven years completed.
11. What is your husband's occupation? What is the nature of his work and for whom does he work? (Be specific - for example: sales clerk at Sears).

12. What is your occupation?

APPENDIX C

INITIAL CONTACTS WITH SUBJECTS

I. CHILDREN'S PRELIMINARY INFORMATION SHEET

NAME _____ AGE _____

GRADE _____ BIRTHDAY _____

1. Are you going to play on any regular league team (or compete in any sport) outside of school this year? _____
(Yes or No).
2. If yes, in what sport? _____
3. Is this the first time you will play on a regular team?
_____ (Yes or No).
4. If you are going to play, have you signed up yet? _____
(Yes or No).

II. INITIAL LETTER TO PARENTS

Your son is one of forty 8-year old boys who have been selected for a research study under the auspices of the University of Alberta. The project deals with behaviour and what it is that determines the choices that children make. As you are probably aware, there is an ever increasing number of leisure time choices available to children. In this particular study we are attempting to find out what it is that influences their choices among the various sports, music, hobbies, and other activities available to them. Your co-operation would be appreciated in order for this project to work.

The information will be gathered through an interview with your son and by having him fill out some questionnaires. All of our contact with your boy will be at his school. It is also necessary to interview the mother of each boy. This interview will require one hour at her convenience and may be at the school, here at the University, or at home just as she prefers. I think you will find the interview interesting without attempting to pry into your personal life. The questions are mainly concerned with your family's leisure time activities and your opinions on related topics. All information will be strictly confidential and once the data is collected no names will be associated with it. No criticisms will be made and no judgments will be involved. We are only interested in what the leisure time choices are and what affects these choices.

I will phone your home shortly after your receipt of this letter to see if you are interested in assisting in this research, and if you are, we can arrange for an interview time.

A summary of the findings of this study will be sent to all those participating.

Sincerely yours,

Terry Orlick,
Ph.D. Candidate.

APPENDIX D

PARAMETRIC VERSUS NON-PARAMETRIC STATISTICS

A major factor considered in relation to data analysis concerned the utilization of parametric versus non-parametric statistics. After reviewing several recent research articles (Anderson, 1970; Box and Anderson, 1970; Feldt and Hsu, 1969; Gaito, 1970; Heermann and Braskamp, 1970; Seeger and Gabrielson, 1968) which focused on this specific problem and consulting with the resident statistician (McGuire, 1972), it was decided to use parametric statistics in the analysis of the data in this study. The rationale behind this decision is discussed below.

A great deal has been written regarding the advantages of non-parametric techniques when the assumptions of parametric methods are not satisfied. "However, a review of the studies, concerned with investigating the effects on tests of significance of failure to satisfy the assumptions of analysis of variance and the two tailed t-test, indicates little distortion even when marked deviations from assumptions occur" (Gaito, 1970:47).

Siegel (1956) contended that parametric statistics (which use means and standard deviations from original scores) should not be used with data in an ordinal scale. He maintained that in order to use a t-test (or F-test), the variables involved must have been measured in at least an interval scale. However, in the past 15 or 20 years, since the writing of his book, there is considerable evidence refuting this position.

Anderson (1970) in responding to the above condition out-

lined by Siegel contended that, "This statement of Siegel's is completely incorrect... the F- (or t-) test may be applied without qualm.... It will then answer the question it was designed to answer: can we reasonably conclude that the difference between the means of the two groups is real rather than due to chance" (Anderson, 1970:54). Gaito (1970) pointed out that Siegel's assumption of the requirement of an interval scale cannot be found if one looks to the mathematical bases of assumptions.

Heermann and Braskamp (1970) maintained that the notion of parametric techniques requiring at least an interval scale can be traced to a paper by S.S. Stevens in 1946. Since that time a number of individuals have rejected Stevens' argument, including Anderson (1970) and Gaito (1970) mentioned above. Gaito (1970) maintained that the important consideration in using parametric statistics is not the scale of the data but the extent to which the data conforms to mathematical assumptions. In light of recent research, Gaito (1970) contended that "...some of the assumed advantages of non-parametric analyses cited have been premature inasmuch as the assumptions of the parametric technique are not as restrictive as once supposed" (Gaito, 1970:38). Anderson (1970) concluded that the type of measuring scale had little relevance to the question of whether to use parametric or non-parametric tests.

Extensive studies, both empirical and theoretical, have been made of the F-test when its assumptions are not met. In the early 1950's Box (1953-54) proved mathematically that

the distribution of mean square ratios is little affected by non-normality and heterogeneity of variance when the samples are of equal size, even when they are relatively small, say five to ten; Tiku (1964) confirmed this result. Cochran (1950) found results utilizing the F-test as valid as using Chi-square for both ordinal and nominal data.

Feldt and Hsu (1969) conducted an extensive research study designed to assess the limitations of sample size and the sensitivity to variance heterogeneity and non-normality. Chi-square tests and F-tests were performed on 5,000 sets of data for the 4 and 5 point scales and 10,000 sets of data for the 3 and 2 point scales. Clearly, the F-test proved to have better control of Type I error. As the sample size increased (to 51) the Chi-square test performed somewhat better. Even with the 3 point scale, the F-test was far more valid if the primary interest of the experimenter was in differences between means. The Chi-square test on the other hand, proved very powerful in detecting differences among the variances of the populations.

The results showed that, with a five point scale, the F-test gave excellent control of Type I error under all conditions. Moderate heterogeneity of variance, platykurtosis, or skewness had little effect even with samples as small as 11 cases per treatment. With a four point scale (and three point scale) control of Type I error was not quite as precise as with a five point scale. For the symmetrical distribution the results of this investigation, with the exception of

results in the two point scale, are quite similar to those of Norton (1953) and Bradley (1964).

Feldt and Hsu (1969) pointed out three reasons why the Chi-square test is not as desirable as an approximately valid F-test:

1. The Chi-square demands a minimum sample size that is higher than that required by the F-test.
2. The Chi-square is not easily extended to factorial designs and tests of interaction.
3. The Chi-square test concerns identity of distributions, not just equality of means. If the populations under consideration differ in variability, but not in means, the hypothesis tested by the Chi-square test is false (Feldt and Hsu, 1969:524).

In their concluding remarks Feldt and Hsu (1969) made the following points. Experimenters need not hesitate to use F-tests with data based on scales of three or more points. However, where circumstances permit scales of five points should be used. When considering data with a limited number of score values, analysis of variance techniques have an advantage over the Chi-square test of independence when the sample size is small, when the study involves more than one factor, or when the primary interest is in the differences among means rather than the variances of the populations. Although violations of the normality of distribution and homogeneity of variance assumptions of parametric statistics may occur when using scaled scores, they need not be of major concern (Feldt and Hsu, 1969:526).

Seeger and Gabrielsson (1968) investigated the possibility of using the F-test for dichotomous data in computer

simulated experiments. The results indicated that, for the examples chosen, the F-test as a rule gives at least as good results as the Cochran's Q-test with regard to the Type I error. They contended that the F-test was fairly robust and insensitive to violations of some underlying assumptions, and their study seemed to indicate that the F-test is justified even for dichotomous data. "It thus seems that the F-test is more useful than the Q-test for statistical evaluation of dichotomous data" (Seeger and Gabrielsson, 1968:76).

After reviewing several studies concerning analysis of variance and t-tests for significance, Box and Anderson (1970) stated, "It can be seen that a large variety of tests for comparing means are robust to both non-normality and inequality of variances. Therefore the practical experimenter may use these tests of significance with relatively little worry concerning the failure of these assumptions to hold exactly in experimental conditions" (Box and Anderson, 1970:40-41). They contended that the exception to this rule was when groups were of unequal size. Anderson (1970) maintained that an interval scale was not a prerequisite to making a statistical inference based on a parametric test.

In psychological work many variables are in fact ordinal though they are justifiably commonly treated as if they were interval or ratio variables, i.e., intelligence tests, attitude tests, personality tests, aptitude tests, etc. (Ferguson, 1966). The versatility of parametric statistics is needed to meet the everyday needs of psychological research (Anderson,

1970). Furthermore, in data where the assumptions for a parametric test are satisfied or approximated and both parametric and non-parametric tests may be applied, the non-parametric tests have less power (Ferguson, 1966; Gaito, 1970). Power is defined as the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis when that hypothesis is false (Ferguson, 1966).

In conclusion then, research studies which investigated the use of parametric versus non-parametric techniques lend support to the utilization of a parametric approach with ordinal (scaled) data, particularly when, (1) the sample size is small, (2) the samples are of equal size, and (3) a five point scale is utilized. When these conditions are met, as was the case in this study, parametric techniques are more powerful. Consequently, it was decided to use parametric inferential statistical methods to analyze the data in the present study.

APPENDIX E

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS

TABLE A-1

SELF PERCEPTION OF SPORTS ABILITY: FREQUENCY
DISTRIBUTION (PERCENT) FOR PARTICIPANT
AND NON-PARTICIPANT GROUPS

Group	-4	-2	0	1	2	3	4
Part	0.0	6.2	12.5	0.0	12.5	25.0	43.8
NonP	12.5	6.2	18.8	25.0	6.2	6.2	25.0

Designations: Part - Participants
NonP - Non-Participants

Maximum possible raw score range: -4 to +4.

TABLE A-2

CHILDREN'S ATTITUDE ABOUT SPORTS: FREQUENCY
DISTRIBUTION (PERCENT) FOR INDIVIDUAL ITEMS
FOR PARTICIPANT AND NON-PARTICIPANT GROUPS
UTILIZING SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL (7 POINT SCALE)

Group	Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Part	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	43.8	0.0	12.5	43.8
NonP	1	0.0	0.0	6.2	62.5	6.2	0.0	25.0
Part	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.2	6.2	43.8	43.8
NonP	2	0.0	6.2	6.2	43.8	6.2	18.8	18.8
Part	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.8	25.0	12.5	43.8
NonP	3	0.0	6.2	0.0	25.0	31.3	18.8	18.8
Part	4	6.2	0.0	0.0	62.5	12.5	6.2	12.5
NonP	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	81.3	6.2	0.0	12.5
Part	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.8	0.0	18.8	62.5
NonP	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	18.8	12.5	31.3
Part	6	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.3	0.0	25.0	43.8
NonP	6	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	0.0	37.5	25.0
Part	7	18.8	0.0	0.0	31.3	12.5	37.5	0.0
NonP	7	6.2	0.0	12.5	43.8	25.0	12.5	0.0
Part	8	31.3	25.0	6.2	25.0	6.2	0.0	6.2
NonP	8	6.2	31.3	6.2	56.3	0.0	0.0	0.0

Designations:

Groups: Part - Participants
NonP - Non-Participants

<u>Item</u>	<u>High Score</u>		<u>Low Score</u>
1	Good	vs	Bad
2	Worthwhile	vs	Worthless
3	Pleasant	vs	Unpleasant
4	Sweet	vs	Sour
5	Nice	vs	Awful
6	Happy	vs	Sad
7	Clean	vs	Dirty
8	Relaxed	vs	Tense

TABLE A-3

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION (PERCENT) FOR ITEMS
COMPRISING ACTIVE PLAY INTERESTS ON SRA INTEREST
INVENTORY FOR PARTICIPANT AND NON-PARTICIPANT GROUPS

Item		Participant		Non-Participant	
Would you like to?		Yes	No	Yes	No
1.	play baseball.....	62.5	25.0	50.0	37.5
2.	go hunting.....	68.8	00.0	50.0	18.8
3.	play cowboys, cops & robbers....	56.3	18.8	50.0	31.3
4.	play tennis.....	56.3	18.8	56.3	12.5
5.	go swimming.....	100.0	00.0	81.3	18.8
6.	play tug-of-war.....	56.3	25.0	56.3	25.0
7.	pitch horse shoes.....	50.0	31.3	31.3	31.3
8.	play kick-ball or dodge-ball....	75.0	12.5	75.0	12.5
9.	play follow-the-leader.....	18.8	62.5	25.0	68.8
10.	fly a kite.....	50.0	12.5	81.3	25.0
11.	flip jack knives.....	56.3	25.0	68.8	6.2
12.	go fishing.....	81.3	6.2	68.8	12.5
13.	play hockey.....	93.8	6.2	25.0	37.5
14.	play hopscotch or "sky-blue"....	00.0	93.8	12.5	62.5
15.	play volleyball.....	56.3	18.8	56.3	18.8
16.	walk on stilts.....	56.3	18.8	68.8	00.0
17.	do folk dancing.....	00.0	93.8	6.2	75.0
18.	play football.....	93.8	6.2	68.8	31.3
19.	roller skate.....	56.3	12.5	31.3	37.5
20.	play basketball.....	62.5	00.0	56.3	25.0
21.	go on hikes.....	62.5	00.0	81.3	31.3
22.	box or wrestle.....	43.8	37.5	50.0	18.8
23.	do marching.....	12.5	68.8	12.5	68.8
24.	go camping.....	93.8	00.0	93.8	00.0
25.	ride horseback.....	81.3	6.2	81.3	6.2
26.	do stunts on bars or on mat....	50.0	25.0	75.0	6.2
27.	explore caves.....	81.3	6.2	93.8	00.0
28.	play ping pong.....	62.5	12.5	50.0	18.8
29.	climb trees.....	68.8	6.2	100.0	00.0
30.	shoot targets with bow & arrow..	100.0	00.0	87.5	12.5
31.	go bike riding.....	68.8	18.8	75.0	6.2
32.	build things out of snow.....	56.3	12.5	81.3	12.5
33.	play tag.....	43.8	37.5	43.8	31.3
34.	play hide-and-seek.....	25.0	50.0	37.5	25.0
35.	do relay racing.....	37.5	25.0	43.8	43.8
36.	go sledding in the snow.....	62.5	12.5	93.8	6.2
37.	throw rocks or darts at target..	75.0	12.5	62.5	31.3
38.	play catch.....	56.3	18.8	50.0	25.0
39.	play jumping rope games.....	6.2	81.3	18.8	68.8
40.	ice skate.....	62.5	6.2	62.5	25.0

Note: The remaining percentage of each group (on each item) was neutral or undecided.

TABLE A-4

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION (PERCENT) FOR ITEMS
COMPRISING QUIET PLAY INTERESTS ON SRA INTEREST
INVENTORY FOR PARTICIPANT AND NON-PARTICIPANT GROUPS

Item		Participant		Non-Participant	
Would you like to?		Yes	No	Yes	No
1.	collect pictures (airplanes, athletes).....	56.3	18.8	56.3	31.3
2.	perform magic tricks.....	18.8	31.3	37.5	31.3
3.	play table games (monopoly).....	75.0	18.8	87.5	00.0
4.	read poems.....	6.2	62.5	12.5	62.5
5.	be in a play, or show.....	43.8	25.0	50.0	25.0
6.	play checkers.....	62.5	12.5	68.8	12.5
7.	play jacks, shoot marbles.....	43.8	18.8	56.3	25.0
8.	write letters to friends, relatives.....	25.0	37.5	37.5	31.3
9.	belong to club.....	75.0	12.5	68.8	6.2
10.	listen to or watch sports (radio, T.V.).....	50.0	31.3	56.3	37.5
11.	make up stories.....	37.5	25.0	56.3	18.8
12.	play car games.....	43.8	31.3	68.8	6.2
13.	play dress up.....	6.2	87.5	25.0	68.8
14.	play house or school.....	6.2	87.5	18.8	75.0
15.	collect stamps or coins.....	56.3	18.8	50.0	25.0
16.	play guessing games.....	25.0	43.8	43.8	18.8
17.	play with a yo-yo.....	68.8	12.5	93.8	6.2
18.	take care of pet animal.....	62.5	18.8	87.5	6.2
19.	read stories.....	43.8	56.3	37.5	31.3
20.	do card tricks.....	43.8	37.5	25.0	50.0
21.	play cards by yourself.....	56.3	37.5	18.8	62.5
22.	play with model train.....	56.3	18.8	68.8	12.5
23.	work jig-saw puzzles.....	43.8	25.0	43.8	43.8
24.	build things with an erector set.....	75.0	6.2	87.5	6.2
25.	visit parents' friends.....	43.8	25.0	81.3	12.5
26.	play with paper dolls.....	00.0	100.0	00.0	93.8
27.	listen to someone read stories...	37.5	37.5	62.5	18.8
28.	listen to or watch stories (radio, T.V.).....	50.0	31.3	56.3	12.5
29.	go to movies.....	93.8	00.0	93.8	00.0
30.	write poems.....	18.8	56.3	25.0	68.8
31.	work crossword puzzles.....	50.0	18.8	43.8	18.8
32.	make a scrap books.....	31.3	31.3	43.8	25.0
33.	go to library.....	56.3	18.8	56.3	18.8

Note: The remaining percentage of each group (on each item) was neutral or undecided.

TABLE A-5

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION (PERCENT) FOR ITEMS
ASSESSING EARLY ACTIVITY PATTERNS OF CHILD
FOR PARTICIPANT AND NON-PARTICIPANT GROUPS
(5 POINT RATING SCALE)

Group	Item	1	2	3	4	5
Part	EAPQ1	0.0	12.5	50.0	18.8	18.8
NonP	1	0.0	56.3	25.0	12.5	6.2
Part	2	0.0	0.0	25.0	31.3	43.8
NonP	2	0.0	12.5	18.8	31.3	37.5
Part	3	6.2	0.0	18.8	31.3	43.8
NonP	3	0.0	25.0	31.3	25.0	18.8
Part	4	0.0	18.8	0.0	18.8	62.5
NonP	4	6.2	0.0	37.5	25.0	31.3
Part	5	0.0	6.2	37.5	43.8	12.5
NonP	5	0.0	6.2	31.3	50.0	12.5
Part	6	0.0	12.5	18.8	18.8	50.0
NonP	6	6.2	12.5	50.0	31.3	0.0
Part	EAPI1	0.0	25.0	12.5	6.2	56.3
NonP	1	25.0	6.2	25.0	25.0	18.8
Part	2	12.5	6.2	12.5	6.2	62.5
NonP	2	18.8	6.2	25.0	18.8	31.3
Part	3	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0
NonP	3	31.3	18.8	37.5	6.2	6.2

Designations:

Groups: Part - Participants
NonP - Non-Participants

Items: Item designations are identical to those
previously listed on Table 15.

TABLE A-6

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION (PERCENT) FOR ITEMS
ASSESSING PRESENT ACTIVITY PATTERNS OF CHILD
FOR PARTICIPANT AND NON-PARTICIPANT GROUPS
(5 POINT RATING SCALE)

Group	Item	1	2	3	4	5
Part	PAPQ1	0.0	0.0	18.8	31.3	50.0
NonP	1	6.2	0.0	31.3	31.3	31.3
Part	2	6.2	6.2	25.0	31.3	31.3
NonP	2	12.5	25.0	31.3	25.0	6.2
Part	3	0.0	6.2	25.0	18.8	50.0
NonP	3	0.0	12.5	31.3	37.5	18.8
Part	4	0.0	12.5	31.3	25.0	31.3
NonP	4	0.0	6.2	50.0	31.3	12.5
Part	5	12.5	18.8	62.5	0.0	6.2
NonP	5	37.5	18.8	31.3	6.2	6.2
Part	6	0.0	12.5	37.5	12.5	37.5
NonP	6	12.5	12.5	37.5	25.0	12.5
Part	PAPI1	12.5	6.2	43.8	18.8	18.8
NonP	1	12.5	18.8	56.3	12.5	0.0
Part	2	0.0	0.0	56.3	31.3	25.0
NonP	2	18.8	31.3	50.0	0.0	0.0
Part	3	0.0	6.2	18.8	18.8	56.3
NonP	3	18.8	6.2	37.5	18.8	18.8
Part	4	0.0	0.0	12.5	37.5	50.0
NonP	4	56.3	6.2	31.3	6.2	0.0

Designations:

Groups: Part - Participants
NonP - Non-Participants

Items: Item designations are identical to those
previously listed in Table 16.

TABLE A-7

MOTHERS' ATTITUDE ABOUT SPORTS: FREQUENCY
DISTRIBUTION (PERCENT) FOR INDIVIDUAL ITEMS
FOR PARTICIPANT AND NON-PARTICIPANT GROUPS
UTILIZING SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL (7 POINT SCALE)

Group	Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Part	1	0.0	0.0	6.2	0.0	0.0	18.8	75.0
NonP	1	0.0	0.0	6.2	12.5	6.2	62.5	12.5
Part	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.2	93.8
NonP	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.3	43.8	25.0
Part	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	6.2	25.0	56.3
NonP	3	0.0	6.2	0.0	18.8	12.5	43.8	18.8
Part	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	87.5	0.0	0.0	12.5
NonP	4	6.2	0.0	0.0	56.3	25.0	12.5	0.0
Part	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	31.3	18.8
NonP	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	12.5	56.3	6.2
Part	6	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	31.3	43.8
NonP	6	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	18.8	18.8	25.0
Part	7	0.0	0.0	6.2	50.0	25.0	6.2	12.5
NonP	7	0.0	6.2	6.2	56.3	18.8	6.2	6.2
Part	8	0.0	31.3	6.2	25.0	18.8	0.0	18.8
NonP	8	0.0	18.8	12.5	37.5	6.2	18.8	6.2

Designations:

Groups: Part - Participants
NonP - Non-Participants

Item	High Score		Low Score
1	Good	vs	Bad
2	Worthwhile	vs	Worthless
3	Pleasant	vs	Unpleasant
4	Sweet	vs	Sour
5	Nice	vs	Awful
6	Happy	vs	Sad
7	Clean	vs	Dirty
8	Relaxed	vs	Tense

APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW EXCERPTS

I. PARTICIPANT CHILDREN'S EXCERPTS

Case 2 (P 1): Age 8

Q. Would you like to be a star on a team?

A. Well no, I'd like to be second star or something like that.

Q. Why wouldn't you want to be the star?

A. 'Cause everybody would be cheering for you... then you'd get all excited and you wouldn't play properly.

Q. Do you think your mother or father would like you to take part in sports?

A. Yeah, that's why they joined me up... I didn't want to go hockey because it gets too cold and sometimes I don't want to go.

Q. Do you really want to go out for the team?

A. I don't care as long as our team wins.

Q. Do you think you will always want to go out for a sports team?

A. No, not that much. I'd rather play with my friends and all that.

Q. If you had your choice now would you go out for hockey or just play with your friends?

A. No... I'd rather play with my friends and throw snowballs and all that.

Q. What's the main reason you're going out?

A. I don't know... my dad just joined me up.

Case 3 (P 3): Age 8

Q. Why would you like to be a football player?

A. 'Cause my dad's been playing football.

Q. Do you think it would make your mother or father happy if you were really good at sports?

A. Yes... because they want me to be good in sports.

Q. Did they tell you that?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you like to play sports?

A. Yes.

Q. What do you like about playing?

A. I like everything... it's lots of fun.

Q. How good do you think you could be at sports?

A. Really good.

Q. Do you think you will always want to go out for a sports team?

A. Yes.

Case 4 (P 5): Age 8

Q. What makes you think your dad would like you to be good at sports?

A. Well, my dad was a good skater and he learned to do lots of stuff... and he'd like me to be like that... I guess.

Q. Why would you like to be an athlete?

A. 'Cause I'll be able to have my sons learn to do stuff and grow up to be one.

Q. What do you think it will be like for you when you go out for the team this year?

A. I'll be pretty good.

Case 5 (P 11): Age 9

Q. Would you like to be an athlete or a member of a little league team?

A. Yes, an athlete.

Q. Why?

A. 'Cause I think I'd qualify for it.

Q. Would you like to be good at sports?

A. Yes... one of the betters.

Q. Why?

A. I guess it just gives you a good feeling.

Q. If you could be anybody in the world, who would you want to be?

A. Joe Kapp... 'cause he plays football.

Q. How good do you think you could be at sports?

A. Very good.

- Q. Do you think it would make your mother or father happy if you were good at sports?
- A. Yes... 'cause they want to see me good at things.
- Q. What do you think it will be like when you go out for the team this year?
- A. Real good.
- Q. What do you like least about sports?
- A. Warm-ups and practices.
- Q. What don't you like about them?
- A. Well, sometimes you have to warm-up for the games and this I don't like... and practices... sometimes it's just a talk... and it's a waste of time.

Case 6 (P 8): Age 9

- Q. Why wouldn't you want to be good?
- A. Well, you get too much publicity.
- Q. How would you change sports so you would like them more?
- A. Oh, I wouldn't have so much practice, you know like there's so much practice just for one game.
- Q. Do you think you will always want to go out for a sports team?
- A. No... not really... I have to have some time for some other stuff instead of sports, sports, sports.

Case 7 (P 6): Age 8

- Q. How good do you think you could be at sports?
- A. Real good.
- Q. Do you think it would make your father or mother happy if you were really good at sports?
- A. Yes... they'd be glad that I was really good at sports.
- Q. What makes you think that?
- A. Like if I come home and say I got goals... he'll say it's good and he says congratulations... it's nice!
- Q. What do you think it will be like for you when you go out for the team this year?
- A. Cold... I might not feel too good 'cause someone checks you... and the whistle blows and you don't want to go back for those guys to come out... you just want to keep on playing... like you don't want to go into the gate... 'cause I get warmer moving when I'm playing.

Case 8 (P 12): Age 9

- Q. Do you think the kids would like you better if you were really good at sports?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What makes you think that?
- A. Well, they always bug me when I lose... and sometimes I win and that's what they like... when I win.
- Q. Do you think it would make your mother or father happy if you were really good at sports?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What makes you think that?
- A. Well, the same thing like... my brother likes when I win the football team when he's on my team... and when I play against my dad he says 'good boy' you won the game.

Case 9 (P 16): Age 9

- Q. Did you like playing hockey?
- A. Well, I wasn't as good as I was the year before that just... for fun.
- Q. What did you like about playing?
- A. Well, I had a whole bunch of my friends on the same team as me.
- Q. What didn't you like?
- A. Usually I was a defenseman and I wanted to be forward.
- Q. How good would you like to be at sports?
- A. Like a pro... like Russ Jackson (Ottawa)... so I'd get lots of money playing.
- Q. What makes you think your dad would like you to be really good at sports?
- A. Oh, my dad said he wants me to play sports 'cause he wants me to win lots of money so I could give it to him.

Case 10 (P 13): Age 9

- Q. Why wouldn't you want to be too good?
- A. It's not that much fun always scoring the goals in hockey and soccer.
- Q. How come?
- A. The kids bug you and if we score a goal in hockey we're supposed to go into the box and wait for the next whistle.

- Q. Do you think the kids would like you better if you were really good at sports?
- A. Some of them would... but quite a few wouldn't because they're really good and they don't like kids kinda getting in their way.
- Q. Do you think you will always want to go out for a sports team?
- A. Not always... I may not join next year.
- Q. Why not?
- A. Well, if I like the team this year then I will join next year... and if I don't, I won't.

II. NON-PARTICIPANT CHILDREN'S EXCERPTS

Case 2 (NP 21): Age 8

Q. What don't you like about sports?

A. I don't like hockey.

Q. How come?

A. 'Cause I can't skate... every time I get up on skates I just fall.

Q. Do you think you would make the team if you went out for it?

A. No.

Q. If you thought you would surely make it would you go out for it?

A. No.

Q. Why do you think you wouldn't go out if you could make it?

A. Well I don't really play sports that much so if I'm on a team and I don't like it very much I might go off.

Q. Do you think you would like it?

A. No, except maybe for certain ones.

Q. Why do you think you don't want to go out for some team this year?

A. I might get a broken arm or something.... In case I get hurt... especially on ice.

Q. Would you like to play on any team?

A. No I'd rather just play for fun... and make up teams with other friends.

Q. Why would that be better?

A. You won't have to rehearse so much.

Case 3 (NP 25): Age 9

Q. Do you play any games or sports after school (like hockey, soccer, baseball, etc.)?

A. No I just go home and watch TV or read a book.

Q. What about in the summer?

A. I usually just lie on our hammock.

Q. Do you think your father or mother would like you to take part in sports?

A. Yeah my dad would.

Q. What makes you think that?

A. My dad watches a lot of football.

Q. What do you think it would be like for you if you went out for a team this year?

A. I'd be a little scared. I might get in everyone's way. People say I do. When we were playing football one time "L" (peer) always says I was in his way.

Q. How good do you think you could be in sports?

A. Not too good.

Q. Do you think you will ever want to go out for a sports team?

A. No.

Q. What do you like to do best?

A. "Kicking thistles", playing pool and ping pong, reading books and taking naps.

Q. Why do you think you didn't go out for a team this year?

A. I might get hurt. You might get a broken arm or leg.

Case 4 (NP 23): Age 8

Q. Do you think your parents would like you to take part in sports?

A. They don't care one way or another.

Q. Why do you think you didn't sign up for a team this year?

A. Because in football I didn't feel like it... and I think my mother and father wouldn't want me to.

Q. What about hockey?

A. Well, I didn't feel like it... I'm not too good at skating.

Q. If you were good at skating would you want to play hockey?

A. Yes.

Case 5 (NP 19): Age 8

Q. Do you think your mother or father would like you to take part in sports?

A. No... they want me to take part in like a club making model airplanes or something... they don't care about me taking sports.

Q. What do you think it would be like for you if you went out for a team this year?

A. Well, I wouldn't really like to... I don't think.

Q. Why do you think you wouldn't like to?

A. Well, I've got quite a lot to do... I've got swimming once a week and I've got lots of things to do at home.

Q. Do you have other things that you like better than playing on a team?

A. Well I like flying my plane... and that's all.

Q. Do you think you will ever want to go out for a sports team?

A. No, I don't think so.

Q. Why do you think you wouldn't want to be on a sports team?

A. Well, I don't think it just suits me.

Q. What would you expect if you went out for hockey or football? What would it be like for you?

A. I don't think I would like it.

Q. What do you think you wouldn't like?

A. Well in football sometimes it's when they tackle people... I wouldn't like to be tackled and in hockey I just wouldn't like it, I don't think.

Case 6 (NP 17): Age 8

Q. Why do you think you don't want to go out for a team this year?

A. I can't go out... 'cause I got too many other things. Cubs and other stuff.

Q. Did someone tell you you couldn't go out?

A. Yeah, my mom and dad... they said I got too much already.

Q. If it was your own choice would you want to or not?

A. Yeah... if I could skate good.

Case 7 (NP 30): Age 9

Q. How good do you think you could be at sports?

A. Not too good.

Q. What do you think it would be like if you went out for a team this year?

A. I wouldn't like it.

Q. Why?

A. In most sports you have to practice every Saturday and I'd rather go out with my family.

Q. What else wouldn't you like?

A. People don't play right... they throw the bat and things like that... they don't play the game right and they argue a lot.

Q. Do you think you will ever want to go out for a team?

A. No... I don't like playing on teams... I only like playing by myself and with my sister and my mom and dad and brother.

Q. Do you like to play sports?

A. Just a few... tennis and car racing.

Q. Why?

A. Well, tennis... you don't play with so many other guys.

Case 8 (NP 20): Age 8

Q. How could you change sports to make them better or more fun?

A. You could do it backwards.

Q. What do you mean?

A. Well, like if the other team gets a goal then you get the points and then if we get a goal... they get a goal. Like we're not really getting a goal... they are... we try to make a goal for them and they try to make a goal for us.

Q. Why do you think that would be better?

A. 'Cause it would help them like each other.

III. DROP-OUT CHILDREN'S EXCERPTS

Case 2 (NP 18): Age 8 Started hockey at 5, dropped out at 7;
 Started baseball at 6, dropped out at 7.

Q. Why did you stop playing hockey?

A. I started not to like it.

Q. What didn't you like?

A. Well, in hockey I quit because I didn't get the puck passed to me too many times.

Q. You didn't get the puck?

A. Oh... only once.

Q. Only once in all the time you played?

A. I think so but I'm not pretty sure... I might have got it a couple of more times than that.

Q. Is that the main reason you don't want to play?

A. Yeah... you know 'cause I got bored of it.

Q. You got bored? How come?

A. 'Cause every night you could be fooling around at your house instead of wasting your time playing hockey. All's I did was sit around... and skate on the ice. I'd skate around where the puck was but it didn't do any good 'cause I'd never get the puck.

Q. Would you like to be an athlete or a member of a little league team?

A. I don't know... 'cause most of the things I do are just all the same.

Q. What do you mean?

A. Well like baseball... it's like hockey 'cause you... I hardly even get a chance... 'cause I'm always at the end of the line in baseball.

Q. So you don't get a chance?

A. Well I get up to bat but I wait such a long time, I forget what I'm doing and I struck out...that's what I did I struck out... every time I went up. Oh, I hit the ball and then I got out and then I struck out... and then I struck out again.

Q. Is that why you didn't go out for baseball again?

A. Yeah.

Q. How good would you like to be in sport?

A. Real good.

- Q. Why do you think you'd want to be real good?
 A. Because if you're not the coach won't think very much about you.
- Q. Do you think it would make your father or mother happy if you were really good at sports?
 A. Yeah.
- Q. What makes you think that?
 A. 'Cause my dad's always wanting me to get into sports... as many as I can.
- Q. What do you think it would be like for you this year if you went out for the team?
 A. I don't really know because I get in but I don't play very well... 'cause in skiing I'm in the smaller groups... and in everything practically.
- Q. What was that again?
 A. Like in skiing when we go up into the mountains when I take lessons, I go with the class but I was the only boy in the class and I was the smallest and the teacher almost forgot about me.
- Q. Do you think you will ever want to go out for a sports team?
 A. No.
- Q. What do you think is the real reason that you don't want to go out for a team any more?
 A. It just kind of bothers me... it bores me... if I play baseball I can hardly even run... I can run a long distance but not very fast.
- Q. If you were better do you think you'd want to go out?
 A. Yeah.... Right now I don't have very much fun. In hockey, I didn't get very much chance to get the puck and in baseball I didn't hit the ball very much. Now I don't want to go out any more.

Case 3 (NP 31): Age 9 Started hockey at 7, dropped out at 7 (after one season); Started baseball at 8, dropped out at 8 (about 5 weeks into season).

- Q. Why do you think you don't want to go out this year?
 A. I won't go out if my mom makes me. I'm going to pick what I want.
- Q. What happened before?
 A. They signed it up and then told me... I didn't really want to go in the first place. But then I had to go. I couldn't stop myself.

Q. Did you stay with it all year?

A. I quit... after about five weeks (baseball).

Q. What was it that you didn't like?

A. You never really got time to play against another team... you just practiced up... you just batted and some guys went out and caught.

Q. Did your parents try to sign you up this year?

A. They asked me if I wanted to go out and if I didn't want to I didn't. I just didn't want to go.

Case 4 (NP 29): Age 8 Started baseball at 7, dropped out at 8 (after one season).

Q. Have you ever played on any regular league teams?

A. Yes. I played baseball last year but I don't think I want to play baseball anymore.

Q. What didn't you like about it?

A. Well, I didn't get to go up to bat any time... I usually just stay on bases and everything and play short stop. I got to go up to bat once everytime we played. I didn't get to bat that much. They let me play outfielder... and short stop. I wasn't that good an outfielder anyway.

Q. Is there anything else that bothers you about playing sports?

A. Yeah, if you play and you have a bad match and guys come up to you and say you're no good at playing baseball or anything like that... and you haven't had a chance to do anything.

Q. Would you like to be good at sports?

A. Yes.

Q. How good would you want to be?

A. Good enough so I could play sports and I wouldn't get fired on anything I went on.

Q. What do you think it would be like for you if you went out for a team this year?

A. I don't know... it might be sort of hard... I don't know if I'd be any good or anything.

Case 5 (NP 32): Age 9 Started baseball at 8, dropped out at 9 (after one season)

Q. Why do you think you went out last year and you don't want to go out this year?

A. Pitching.

Q. What happened with the pitching?

A. I was lousy.

Q. What made you think you were lousy?

A. I could tell... 'cause my balls weren't going right.

Q. Were there other things you didn't like or that made you feel bad?

A. Trying to hit the ball they pitched to me.

Q. How often did you hit the ball?

A. Not too many times.

Q. How could they change a game like that so it would be more fun and you'd like it better?

A. Make the bases smaller... make the bats bigger.

Q. Is there some other sport you would want to try?

A. No, not really.

Q. Did you think it would be better than it was?

A. Yes.

Q. What do you think it would be like if you went out for a team this year?

A. Probably not make it.

Q. Do you think you will ever want to go out for a sports team again?

A. Not really.

Q. If you thought you'd surely make the team, would you go out?

A. Yes.

Case 6 (NP 22): Age 8 Started soccer at 7, dropped out at 7 (within a few weeks after starting)

Q. How did you like it last year when you went out for soccer?

A. I didn't like it very much 'cause they never let me play. They just let the good guys play... the little guys just have to stand around... and watch.

Q. Are you going to go out again?

A. If they let me play I would.

Q. Were there a lot of kids who didn't play?

A. Yup, most of the team didn't get to play... just some guys did... just the big guys. Everybody else just stands around.

Q. Did you stay for the whole season?

A. I stayed a couple of weeks... then I quit because I never got to be what I wanted to.

IV. PARTICIPANTS' MOTHERS' EXCERPTS

Case 2 (P 2):

- Q. What events or activities do you get together as a family to partake in?
- A. Tobogganing, tubing, swimming, boating.
- Q. What sports equipment do your boys have?
- A. Football, basketball, soccer ball, baseball, skis, ski boots, all the hockey equipment, hockey sticks for road hockey or ice hockey, swimming equipment, fins, masks.
- Q. Do you or your husband ever watch your boy play or practice sport related activities?
- A. I've never missed a game in organized hockey. We never take them and drop them off and then go and pick them up again.
- Q. What sorts of activities should be offered through the community?
- A. I'd like to see flag football for young boys because I don't feel that there should be the body contact when they are young.
- Q. What about for hockey?
- A. If you've ever heard any of your NHL stars, Gordy Howe for instance feels that skating, handling the puck and shooting are far more valuable to the youngster than hitting. And after all the little guys are growing... and my son (8 year old) had a broken collar bone from this last... from someone cross-checking him on the boards. I don't feel that this is necessary. I think they can show their ability far better by skating and handling the puck than knocking the other kid over. My boy wasn't the only one ...we had another boy in pee wee's who had a broken collar bone last year too. Those things happen but you hate to see them.
- Q. Is there anything you dislike about sports?
- A. There are so many coaches in hockey who perhaps were not good enough to make the Big-Time and so they are trying to push the kids that they're coaching into that Big-Time instead of giving them straight enjoyment and teaching them basics. And my boys are young and there's lots of time for the hitting and the body contact in hockey...but you have so many coaches now with even the six year olds saying 'get out there and hit them... slow them down.' Instead of teaching them the basics and enjoyment of getting out there and learning and doing something and doing it well... but I don't think you should take it out on the kids because they made a bad play at that age.

Q. Just watching the games do you see that quite often?
(Mother has three boys playing hockey and has never missed a game.)

A. Yes...you do... oh yes!

Q. Do you think the coaches are out there to win at that level?

A. Oh, the majority of them are, yes. Last year our boys were very active in flag football and we had a situation where our older boy (D.) wasn't the top player and so when it came to the final games he sat on the bench... whereas R. in the junior league was quite good for his age so he played the whole time, offense and defense... and then there were the other little fellows who sat on the bench. So we were in a situation where we felt badly to think that D. didn't play and yet we had the same feeling for those other little fellows in R's league that sat on the bench.

Q. Are there a lot of kids sitting in the hockey?

A. Quite a few, yes. If it's a close game, they'll put in the best that they have and the other ones sit. I think for the tiny mites and pee wees... the whole thing isn't to win. It's to get out there and teach the kids sports-manship.

Q. Where do you think the pressure comes from?

A. In some cases it comes from both coach and parents... but I wouldn't say that all coaches are this way. Our tiny mite hockey coach last year wasn't a pressure coach. He was there to give the boys the enjoyment and he would teach them what he knew... the boys liked him real well.

Now D's football coach, there were two coaches, and they were strictly to win and the coaches from the two teams argued more than the players did... because no matter what they did they had to win and the boys felt this... naturally. And so they pick out their outstanding stars and they're the ones that play... and I think the other kids felt that too.

Case 3 (P 16):

This is an excellent community... now he played in Regina and it was ridiculous, he never got on the ice... nobody even knew who he was... the kids were running it pretty well and it really got to be bad news because their friends got on all the time... and the other little ones would be really disappointed. I think it's great over here where they've got it really organized and they've had the hockey school and everything else.

Q. How was it set up where you were before?

A. It was in the school yard and you'd come and just be put on a team... I never knew when the games were... and then twice he went over there and came home in tears 'cause the game had been played an hour earlier than they told him... they never had uniforms which I think gives the kids... makes them feel important enough to go out and play... I think it does a lot for their idea of the sport too.

It was terrible before it was really organized in Regina... they tended to leave kids out... they would just stand there in the cold... and someone would say, 'well you're not on my team'... and of course they wouldn't know them... they never had a practice or anything where they'd get to know each other on a team... it was more or less go out and whoever was the biggest was the best. It wasn't even according to ages. It's fantastic the way they have it organized here.

Case 4 (P 12):

Q. Have you or your husband encouraged him to participate?

A. Yes... I think my husband has pushed the hockey more than I have... it's the organized business that I don't like... they have 2 games a week, Tuesday night and Saturday morning and 2 practices at night... and it's too much for a nine-year old boy.

Q. How do you think you encouraged him?

A. Well, my husband bought him all the equipment for one thing, and you know he asked... he thought it would be great to be on the team... but I don't think it was ever explained to him the time that was involved and really what it was all about. I mean you can make something sound very enthusiastic and they're all enthused about it but I don't know whether it's entirely to the good... of course I don't think we realized they organized these young ones as much.

J. is organizing a floor hockey group for the grade fours (in school). That sort of thing I think's great... you know they can go and play a bit after school if they want to... and it's entirely their own choice. I just don't think this organized hockey bit is for the good of the little ones at all.

Q. Is there anything you'd like to see changed?

A. Yes. In the younger groups, some of the organization could be taken out of it. When they started last year it was stated that this really wasn't that organized until they got up to 10, 11 and 12 and into the city teams but that's not so... I think people get carried away with it... they're organized at 6, 7 and 8... that's ridiculous.

I think the swimming lessons are very good. They're not pushed... they go strictly at their own speed and they take a lot of time with them.

I might add that my husband and I don't entirely agree on it; he doesn't feel that it's that overly organized. He feels they have to learn to compete and get right in there.

Q. Is there anything you dislike about sports or organized sports, especially for kids?

A. Yes, as I mentioned with the hockey, I really don't feel they're ready to be putting so much into an organized sport... it takes the fun out of it for them... it develops a drive that I don't think is healthy. They don't just go and have fun and enjoy it... it gets to be a real serious business... and it's just not right at that age... they have to have a little more... just pick it up and drop it sort of thing.

Q. So you think it takes the fun out of it?

A. It is yes... you know they wear themselves out... it isn't just a matter of using up energy with hockey... they're just exhausted with the schedule... it's the time involved... it interrupts the meal hour so it breaks up our family time because he has to eat early and somebody has to be ready to drive by 6 o'clock.

They don't just accept the kids and mix them all up... they do pick them out according to ability and the very best skaters are on the one team... there's no mix where you have some poor kids and good kids... it's just too much.

Q. Where do you think the push to win comes from?

A. The parents... the kids have got nothing to do with it... their advice isn't asked in this... I mean they don't ask to have these things made up into teams... and organized like this. I mean they'd just as soon everybody got together and had a good game. It wouldn't occur to them to organize it like that.

I'd rather see it where the thing is just available and the kids are left to do it on their own.

Q. Do you think they should be organized at any age?

A. Well, I think maybe by the time they're 12, 13, or 14 they're a little more ready for it and they can express an opinion then as to whether they want to get on a team. I don't think at this age they really know whether they want to play it that much or not... they don't know anything about it.

Q. Why do you think they're playing?

A. I think they're playing because they've been encouraged to play by the parents... the teams are there and available, it's what the other kids are doing... parents feel, 'well the kids should belong to something'... and this is what's available... it isn't available to go and just play.

It's just not available right now... as a matter of fact they're supposed to be putting in a pleasure skating rink... but I don't think hockey will be allowed on it... the hockey rink is pretty well filled up. And when they've got all these practices and games, it doesn't leave them much time to go and just shoot a puck around... they've got to work their homework in sometime... so that has to be done after school.

Q. If it was up to you would you want him to play in an organized sport?

A. No, I'd sooner that he didn't.

Q. But your husband would rather that he did?

A. Yes, he feels that they learn more... they learn to compete and to stand up for themselves as much as anything... and maybe J. needs this but I don't really think so... and he feels they'll learn to skate better and just learn more about it... that if he's left to do it on his own they'll have fun at it but they won't learn anything. But I don't think so... they might not learn much right now but they'll acquire an interest which will eventually lead to them learning more... I think they'd pick up enough to get by.

Case 5 (P 7):

Q. Would R. rather go to cubs than to hockey?

A. Well, he said last night that he wasn't going to go to hockey that he was going to go to cubs... 'I missed two weeks of cubs now and I don't want to miss anymore'. I said 'well you better go tonight'... I was sort of pushing into the hockey but I feel when they're getting started the coach is sorta counting on them just to see what he does have.

Q. Have you or your husband encouraged him to get involved in sports?

A. Oh I think probably my husband has... yes... he played sports when he was young and so he enjoys it... he goes with the boys... he usually manages the team that they're on.

- Q. How do you think he has encouraged them?
- A. Oh, I think from when they were quite young they see daddy watching things on T.V. and he usually says why they're doing this or why they're doing that. This is why I think they know far more about sports than I do.
- Q. What should be available in the community?
- A. We need an inside arena... I think it would give the kids a better chance... poor old R. came home with his fingers frozen last week... and this week there was nothing (20° below). He didn't realize how cold he was. We found an advantage being down East... these kids could start in October and went right through to March or April... and they really came along.
- Q. Is there anything you dislike about sports or organized sports especially for kids?
- A. I think some coaches take it just a little bit too serious for the little fellows... I don't like this... you know we're out to win and regardless... you know at all costs ...I don't think this is exactly what... I like the idea more emphasizing the team spirit... working together rather than out to win... which we've come up against over the years with a couple of coaches with D. I don't like that feeling.
- My husband has come away from hockey coaches' meetings just about ready to kill somebody... some of them take it too seriously. I guess their attitude really isn't very nice.
- Q. Those coaches that you did run up against, what sorts of things did they do that made you think they were too serious about the game?
- A. Well, I think just one instance I'm thinking of... you know 'go out and maim somebody if it means getting a goal' sort of thing. And another case sort of cheating in that ...play the players that you know are good, even though you play them too often. Down East you're supposed to give equal time to each player regardless of how he plays, which we thought was very fair for little guys... and it was surprising over the year how you'd see those kids improve... some of them could hardly stand up when they'd start the year... by the time the season rolled around they weren't doing too badly. But some of the coaches would try to slip somebody in that they shouldn't have... and that's not fair play and that's not what you're trying to teach kids.
- Q. Where do you think the serious-win attitude comes from?
- A. I think it's probably the coaches... I think it's the person themselves... they'll treat life this way... if they cheat on something and get away with it... I would think a lot of people play sports as they live.

Case 6 (P 1):

- Q. Do you have any expectations of your kids in terms of them participating or not?
- A. Yes, we expect that they will and they do. I think P's whole life is recreation at the moment, it's hard to get him to do anything else (fishing, hockey, soccer, swimming).
- Q. How have you encouraged your kids to get involved in sports?
- A. Well, we just joined them to as many activities as we could... and we actually make them go when they are little until they are old enough to choose whether they wanted to go... the older ones now choose their recreations... but at the start we just joined them and made them go until they understood the game and then if they didn't like it, well fine.
- Q. How old do you think they have to be before they can choose their own...?
- A. Well, about eleven or so.
- Q. What do you dislike about sports?
- A. The competitiveness... you know, giving trophies to various people as the best person on the team and this kind of rubbish when you're 8 and 9 years old. This best player bit at this age is a little much.
- Q. Where do you think the emphasis should be?
- A. Just on playing... just to enjoy sports all year round. most of the things they are in are not competitive... the skiing and this kind of thing. It's mainly the organized sport I don't care for too much.

Case 7 (P 3):

- Q. Have you encouraged your children to get involved in sports?
- A. We've taken them since they've been little babies... they both started swimming when they were babies and skating too... we do things anyway so we take them along.
- Q. Is there anything you dislike about sports?
- A. Every kid should play equal time... I don't think that will happen here... all the coaches want to win... where we came from it was sort of everybody plays... you're on the ice for 3 minutes and off... and there was no emphasis on winning... and it was fun. But here the coaches have side bets already. I don't like that... I don't think they should push kids.

Case 8 (P 4):

Q. Have you encouraged active play over quiet play?

A. M. is just an active child... you can't even encourage quiet play... he just isn't interested... he prefers to be doing things... constantly doing things... It's something we haven't encouraged; it's a natural development.

Q. Is there anything that you dislike about sports?

A. Yes. The attitude is you must win... win... win... that I don't like. I don't like it when it's so competitive that it spoils it. The kids are made to feel that it's so darned important that nothing else exists... and that's not true... it's just for the fun of the game... and if they lose, well better luck next time type deal. They shouldn't be forced to feel bad about it... or that they're not up to standard or that they're inadequate in some way.

Q. Where do you think that pressure comes from?

A. Adults... I think honestly and truly... a lot of it comes from the parents. I think both in the United States and here, everybody is out to win. In Britain more people are involved just for the joy of it or the fun of it... for getting together... there's none of this brow-beating attitude... get out and win. It's probably changed in Britain as well, this was 10 years ago.

Q. Where would you want the emphasis for a little league team?

A. Just to go out and have fun and enjoy it.

Case 9 (P 8):

Q. How have you encouraged him to get involved in sports?

A. Just because we've been involved in sports I think he's sort of interested... it's just sort of been a natural thing... the interest was there.

Q. Is there anything you dislike about sports?

A. Well, sometimes I think the emphasis is placed too heavy on winning... you know, they've got to be a winner and if they're not... they're no good sorta thing... you know. That sort of bothers me sometimes.

Last spring in the paper there was a series of articles... people wrote in and said what poor sports the coaches were because when their team didn't win... it was sort of glory for them when their team won. My husband went to a game where the coach was just a nervous wreck because his team wasn't winning... and that's bad.

But from what I can see with the men working with our children here, they're awfully good... it doesn't matter to them if they win or not, they're trying to create a good atmosphere for the children to enjoy sports.

Q. What would you want emphasized?

A. Just nurturing good sportsmanship... not so much the winning business... if they're winning fine. In the case of children the emphasis shouldn't be on being the big winner... if they just tried to create good sportsmen out of the children because that's going to go off to other areas of their lives too... that they don't always have to be heroes.

Case 10 (P 10):

Q. What do you think should be emphasized?

A. Getting out there and doing something and enjoying it is the most important rather than working so hard and trying to be the greatest hockey player that ever was. Sports to me is a recreation and you do it because you enjoy doing it... not because you've got to do it... you've got to be the greatest. Sports should be relaxed and enjoyable... not win, win, win, win.

Q. Have you encouraged your son?

A. Maybe I pushed just a little bit this year... we moved here (to this neighborhood) about 5 months ago. And when time came to sign up for hockey... all of the boys said, 'well we're not going to play this year'... and I felt like it was probably because they didn't know any of the boys on the team... and I told them we had too much money tied up in hockey equipment for them not to play hockey... because I felt like they would meet more of the boys and they have got to have some activity in the winter time... something that will get them out of the house. So I may have pushed them a little bit there.

Q. Anything you dislike about sports?

A. In the children's organized sports... it's this win at any cost. I feel like that if a team has maybe three lines each boy should get to play in each game. We have played against teams... that they were so bent on winning that only their best ones played. I feel like down in this junior hockey that everyone should have a chance at it whether they're any good or not. This goes for baseball and hockey and any other junior teams... for the younger kids I think if they go out and they practice each week, they should have a chance to play in the game.

Q. Were there many coaches who didn't play some kids?

A. There were several and one in particular.

Case 11 (P 13):

- Q. Is there anything you dislike about sports or organized sports especially for kids?
- A. It does bother me if there's too much emphasis put on winning... and not enough put on just learning fundamental skills at their age level (9)... and the attitude of the coaches if it happens to be the type that blames a lot on the referee or tends to call down the referee... or in hockey if they're relying too much on body contact and not enough on fundamentals of playing the game.
- Q. Do you think there is an emphasis on winning at that age level?
- A. Sometimes there is... depending entirely upon the coach... because you can have two coaches in the same league and it will just entirely depend on the coach.
- Q. Where would you like the emphasis?
- A. Learning the game and the fun of it... just having fun... because they very quickly feel if their coach is disgusted because they didn't win... they very quickly feel this... and have occasionally come home and said 'I don't want to play anymore'. Or if the coach runs down the referee, he can disagree with the calls, but to actually run him down or call him out... they quickly pick this up too.

Case 12 (P 14):

- Q. Do you have any expectations of your kids participating or not participating in sports?
- A. D. would like to be a football player... I would like him to go on a football scholarship if he could. As far as my daughter is concerned, there's nothing available. If we could get him a football scholarship in the States, I'm sure we'd send him.
- Q. Why would you like him to participate?
- A. Physically and mentally, and especially mentally it's good for you... I think it gives you a better outlook on life. You become more competitive for one thing... physical exercise is good for you... it helps you sleep for one thing. It's just good for you all round as opposed to not doing any physical exercise.
- Q. Do you have any expectations as to the level he may attain?
- A. Well, I'm a pusher and my husband's not... I expect more from him. I have great expectations for him but whether they turn out... I'd like him to really ski... I'd like him to be interested in skiing and golfing especially because these are carry on sports... the ones you do forever.

Q. Is there anything you dislike about sports?

A. Well, we were involved in a real competitive hockey league in Toronto and some parents really are wild... like they're yelling at their kids... 'Get that kid and get that kid' and things like that... I don't like that... but I think it's better organized in the East 'cause every kid gets a chance to play... it doesn't matter if he's the rottenest skater in the world... where out here it's not like that. I think they tend to favor the better players.

I really think that everybody thinks their child is the greatest... and they're really not... and I think they expect too much. We've seen children in tears come off the ice because they haven't done things right, and I don't think that's right... better to stay home and let him enjoy what he's doing than stand out there and yell at him.

I think everybody wants their child to be a winner... and some parents I don't think even like sports... they're competitors and that's all... they don't sort of let the child enjoy just being out there and doing it. I think we're all competitive anyway... but some of the parents get a little crazy. I think the kids get nervous when the parents are shouting their lungs out.

The most important thing is just to do it and get the ice time... just to play... because at 15 or 14 they've all dropped off... only the real die-hards, the kids who are really interested in sport carry on... but not the rest.

Q. Why do you think they all drop off?

A. 'Cause they're not that good... or maybe they haven't had a chance to be that good.

Q. How have you encouraged your son to get involved in sports?

A. Because we do everything... I think it's just automatic... if your parents do it, you'll do it.

Case 13 (P 5):

Q. How did you encourage your children to get involved in sports?

A. I bought them skis and pushed them out there... they weren't too interested in skiing until they got out there and tried it... and then they enjoyed it. I may have pushed at first but not continually if they didn't like it.

He (son) does look up to his father a lot... like he wants to play golf... I think because his father does... he's really quite a big image at this point.

- Q. Is there anything you dislike about sports?
- A. I think they can overdo it a bit... too much time and too much pressure... I think it's good if every child can play no matter what his ability is. I think a lot depends on the coaches... like in soccer this year... and it's happened a couple of years... the poorer boys... they haven't even played. Most men try to get them to play... but there's kids left out and it's really sad. It's too competitive that way.

We have three boys playing in city teams in hockey and we kind of feel that only one team should be in the city and the others should be in the peanuts or little Richard league... this is much better for them... not the competition... these kids are getting killed... it's just too much for them.

Case 14 (P 9):

It's a pity that you have to be so good to be on a team. The little boy across the street is chubby and can't run very fast. In soccer they'd let him play a few minutes and take him off to let somebody better play. D. asked him if he was going out this year and he said, 'No, I don't think so'. I'm sure it was because he didn't think he'd make the team. This was really sad. I'm sure it was because he didn't think he was good enough.

When my son (older) started playing football in high school his whole personality changed. He started to think that winning was the only thing in the world. He used to call me old-fashioned when I tried to tell him there were other things. He would say, 'You've got to play to win'.

I'm English of course you know and when the older boys started to play in organized sports in hockey I thought they were pretty brutal you know... the only thing to do was to win and if you didn't win it was the end of the world for them.... It took me a long time to get used to that theory.

Couldn't they have a sort of a house league system in the schools so that everybody could be on a team and everybody could participate?

- Q. When you watch the games (last three years) do you find that some kids don't play or do they let everybody play?
- A. Yes, some of them don't get to play... I've noticed that. I used to notice that in the soccer games in Vancouver... there were some little kids who were only out a few minutes in the whole game and I felt so sorry for them... they would stand there shivering in their little short soccer pants... and the best kids would be out there on the field. But here it's this competitive spirit you see... if they see they're losing they have to send their best guys out.

I wish it could be that everyone could just go out and enjoy it. It seems a pity that so many of them get discouraged... because they're not first class... but that's the way it is over here.

Q. Would you like to see anything changed to make sports better?

A. There should be facilities for more children to play... it shouldn't be only for the best ones.

Q. Is there anything you dislike about sports?

A. Well, the only thing is that I do think some of the sports over here are a little bit brutal... I think sometimes the hockey coaches push these little guys too hard.

Q. What do you mean?

A. Well, they expect them to do too much... they make them stay out on the ice too long... they get exhausted. I know it's good for the kids to have this concentrated training but sometimes it seems a little bit much. I don't worry about D. because he can take it but some of his little friends are pretty bushed when they come off there.

I really think there's too much emphasis on winning at this age level... but nobody agrees with me... you ask my husband. And his brothers too... they say, 'Well, that's football' or 'That's hockey... that's the way it is... they have to be pushed'.

Sometimes they do push these small kids... and on these outdoor rinks when the weather is 10° below and these poor little kids that are freezing to death. The little boy down the street... he was crying at one of the games... his hands were just frozen off... they should have taken him in... not left him there. My own boy cried a few times last year... frozen feet and what have you.

Q. Where do you think the emphasis on winning comes from?

A. The fathers.

Q. Where do you think the emphasis should be?

A. Well, of course I've got a really square answer... they should just play to enjoy the game... but everybody laughs at me... even R. (older son) used to laugh at me when I said that... 'What's the use of playing if you're not going to win'. I think it's wonderful if they win but if they don't they shouldn't take it so badly. You should play for the joy of playing and if they win that's something extra... isn't it?

- Q. Do you think that's common thinking?
A. No... nobody thinks that way except me. I've always been shouted down when I've said things like this so usually I don't express my opinions anymore.

I think it's such a pity, you know that here you have to be good at a sport to participate... you see in Europe, everybody plays... you don't have to be good. When I played field hockey and net ball, I wasn't particularly good at either of those games but I played throughout my childhood and when I was a young person... but I'm sure if I'd been playing in this country I wouldn't have been good enough to make the team... therefore I probably wouldn't have played. They do emphasize that too much here... you know you've got to be really good to make it. Isn't it a pity, really.

V. NON-PARTICIPANTS' MOTHERS' EXCERPTS

Case 2 (NP 19):

- Q. Were you or your husband ever athletes or active in sports?
A. I never liked them very much... mainly because I think I wasn't very good... and I think this is the secret of it ...if you're successful at it then you're more likely to do it.
- Q. Would you like your son to participate in sports?
A. Yes, something mild... I don't like these very rough games though... I don't think I would like him particularly to do hockey... unless he was just going down in the evening and having fun knocking the puck around. I think this is good... but I don't like anything with a great deal of pressure behind it... if it is sport. I'd like them (her kids) to enjoy it...
- Q. Is he (son) involved in any activities outside the regular school P.E. program?
A. Just the cubs... he loves that... the cubs is marvelous. D. loves the cubs... most people we've spoken to really enjoy it. I almost called G.G. after the party because the children enjoyed it so much and it was obvious that so much effort had been put into it. The leader makes a lot of difference. D's really not very keen on sports. He's not a fighting sort of child.
- Q. What do you like about sports?
A. Well I think the main thing really is to have fun and get this team spirit and enjoy yourself. But when it matters whether there are goals... when there's a lot of pressure... this is when I don't like it. Mainly... probably because when I was a child playing on a team if I missed... you see there were lots of boo's and things... and this I think discourages people from playing.
- Q. What do you dislike about sports?
A. I think with the children they more or less had to play in these baseball matches at school and once my daughter was hit on the head with the ball... she had a huge lump ... I'm sure this put her off an awful lot... well I know it did. I think when they're small the game could be adapted a little... and I really think the emphasis there should be on fun for them... having lots of fun together and the pressure left out all together... And there again she found this too; she just couldn't hit the ball... and every time she missed they had some sort of rhyme that these boys would shout... and this does upset a sensitive child, and I know they've got to live with it therefore,

I say, 'well take no notice, it's silly to take any notice'. Well she didn't go for one or two matches and the final one she did go back reluctantly and we had a little talk and she said she'd go for the last match.

I think when they are small everything should be done to encourage them to do their best and have little matches but I think these children should be discouraged by the staff if they hear them shouting these things at others.

I think it's very easy for a person to become popular through sport through very little effort... if they're good at it they get points for their team... whereas other children may put effort into it and just get nowhere.

Q. How would you adapt the sport for the children?

A. Well, I think they could have had a softer ball, and football goal posts could be little for kids... and just make these games a little bit simpler for them.

Q. From your own experience how could your own first experiences have been positive?

A. When I went to secondary school we had all of the apparatus out immediately... as soon as I got on top of that box, I felt quite sick... you know to jump off... and immediately we were left behind. And the teacher also wasn't very pleasant with us... she classed us as just being lazy. When I was about 15 we had a new teacher and she was full of the new P.E. which was movement and expression... for the first time I started to enjoy P.E. You see anyone could be successful... if we'd have started off like this, we would have developed much better, rather than being faced with this apparatus and commands such as leap frog over the box, you know... we were failures before we'd started.

I think I'm against organized sports... I'm against the idea. You know it's pressure all the time... if there's a lot of pressure put on it then I don't agree with it... but if they're just encouraged to do their best and put up a good fight this is fine... if it's not carried to excess ... it's all a matter of keeping it in perspective.

Case 3 (NP 23):

We are really not a sports-minded family as far as spectator sports or group sports are concerned. We like the things you do by yourselves. We haven't encouraged the boys to take part... we left it strictly up to them... they haven't come up with the idea they want to so we've just let it lie.

- Q. Do you have any expectations as to whether or not your children will participate in sport?
- A. No, we're not anxious, both my husband and myself are not anxious to see them participate in soccer or baseball or ice hockey. I really... I'm more or less against it... if I could choose because I feel they're organized far too early. I like to see them go out and skate but I don't like this business of organized to win and unhappy if they don't... too much... too early. I don't think the organized sports are a good thing.
- Q. What is it that you don't like about the organized sports?
- A. The competitiveness. I must be honest... I have very little knowledge of it but from what I do see... I've had friends ...mothers... say their child has come home in tears because their group didn't win and their leaders are unhappy ...and if the child is not really good he's put out on the side lines because only the ones that are really good should be in there... and this type of thing doesn't appeal to me. I feel that you play the game... or should... for the fun of playing... and maybe improving yourself.
- Enjoyment is the whole idea as far as sports are concerned... to me. I don't like making sports a livelihood ...it's all right as a second place... to me academic achievement is far more important.
- I didn't come from a sports-minded family and neither did my husband... so I think from both sides we really don't take too much interest in sports.
- Q. Is there anything you can think of to change in organized sports to make them acceptable to you?
- A. Yes, if they stressed more the fun of playing and a little less the idea that to win is so very important.

Case 4 (NP 30):

- Q. Do you think you would like him to participate in sports, organized sports?
- A. No, I don't think so because I think they go overboard a little.
- Q. What do you mean by overboard?
- A. Like the hockey here, it's getting to the stage where it's not really a fun sport anymore... it's just not a fun sport anymore... it's too organized... it's drummed into the kids, they have to be there, you have to win.
- Q. What else bothers you about sports?
- A. When it gets past a sport... when it turns into fighting or clobbering someone just for the sake of winning... I think it's wrong to get the kids so determined to win that they're going to hit somebody with the stick on purpose or trip them up on purpose just for the sake of winning a game.

- Q. How would you describe D's level of activity when he was a baby?
- A. Very, very mild.
- Q. What were some of his keen hobbies or interests in the past year?
- A. His rock collecting and trees, flowers, birds. Also playing the piano.

Case 5 (NP 28):

I was never very athletic... I was never very good at it. S. is just anti-sports... he reads a lot and writes a lot. S. will not go to swimming lessons anymore. He went last year and we enrolled him this year but he wouldn't go... he will go to swim on a Sunday as long as it's not swimming lessons... and he's got to do a certain amount. He likes to go just for the fun of it but he doesn't like to go because it's lessons and he's got to go.

Case 6 (NP 27):

- Q. Does your husband read about sports in the newspaper?
- A. Very seldom... I don't at all... I skip the sports page.
- Q. What do you dislike about sports?
- A. Like in hockey and football, for one thing it's quite rough... and then the competition... it's not really sports anymore, I don't think... my two boys took swimming lessons and there was so much pressure on them that now I can't even mention the word swimming.
- He, himself, I don't know if he told you this, thinks we cheat him because he has to practice his piano an hour a day so he can't get out enough.

- Q. Does he like the piano?
- A. No

Case 7 (NP 24):

- Q. Have you encouraged quiet play or active play?
- A. I would say quiet play because I'm not sports-minded myself. I like peace and quiet.

Q. What do you like about sports personally?

A. Well, I don't like sports, I never have... I don't know really why... I got too sweaty... it was probably the competition... I didn't like to compete that well... I didn't like being a failure. I had a teacher who was convinced I was going to like basketball... he threw the ball at me and broke my finger.

When we were first married I used to follow the world series just because everybody else did and you were sort of out of it if you didn't.

I don't like to see parents pushing their kids just to out-do someone else. We'd like our kids to be well-rounded; if they like sports that's fine. I don't think they should spend every spare minute on sports because there are lots of other things to do. I like handicrafts and art... this is more my line.

Case 8 (NP 20):

At the school they announced a Saturday morning calisthenics class for children and I asked J. if he wouldn't be interested in going... I said I'd be glad to sign him up... but he said he wasn't interested. Now if he goes tobogganing he's so happy and excited about it he comes home and tells about his different experiences.

Q. What do you dislike about sports?

A. I didn't realize how strongly I felt until I had a discussion with my bus driver last winter. He was so angry with the young boys (Junior High) who were riding on his bus and he said 'what they need to do is all be on a little league team and they'd sure'... you know... 'get their energy used up... that's what they need... even if they were playing every night and I wouldn't have trouble with them on the bus'.

Now I really don't agree with that kind of an approach. And when some people feel that way about sports and organized sports then I think that's too bad. Opportunities for developing yourself becomes a way of getting rid of children or tiring them out. I think that's a terrible response because that really isn't caring about the person or the individual... that's just trying to discipline or punish almost, they make it... I know this one man just felt that boxing was so important for every boy to really make a man out of him... and I just don't feel that that's what makes a man a man.

Q. What do you think the main benefit or attraction for kids should be in organized sports?

A. I think they should be involved both for developing their skills and for pleasure but not for a lot of pressure or for the wrong kind of recognition that is given to these youngsters.

VI. DROP-OUT MOTHERS' EXCERPTS

Case 2 (NP 18):

- Q. How have you encouraged your kids to get involved in sports?
- A. I think by our attitude, you know... it's sort of a healthy, good thing to do and a lot of fun... and we drive them here and there... and we buy them skates and buy them equipment ...we buy them what we can.
- Q. Is P. training in any activities outside of P.E.?
- A. No, we tried to enroll him in hockey but he's not that keen on it.
- Q. What do you dislike about sports?
- A. If the parents don't become involved with the children then they really don't know what goes on... and... sometimes there's a lot of pressure on the children... and I don't think that's too good for them. I think if the parents get in there and see what's going on it would help quite a bit. Sometimes it's too competitive, I think... for the children.
- Q. You mean if they (the parents) can see there's a lot of pressure put on the kids, they can...
- A. Explain it to them or complain or try to adjust to it if they can.
- Q. Where do you think the pressure comes from?
- A. Well, I think it builds up on the team 'cause everybody likes to win... I suppose being parents we like our kids to win more than other kids too. I think we sort of have to watch it ourselves. Competition's fine but it could end up like the NHL out here, with all the little kids. I'm thinking of hockey... if they don't practice and keep up well then they don't... perhaps they don't get played. If it's a close game some coaches... they play their best team rather than playing them in rotation... they play their best line. And in a way this encourages the children to shape up and that's what you have to watch... you don't want to make it too rough so that they get discouraged. I think that's the problem.

Case 3 (NP 31):

- Q. Have you encouraged your son to get involved in sports?
- A. I don't ask them... now do you want to do this... I say now look... try these... you may decide you like it... so I didn't say do you want skiing, or hockey because T. would say no to everything... I know that because we forced him to take swimming lessons, now he knows how to swim but I just don't see giving 8 and 9 year olds a freedom of choice. When they get to be teenagers then they can decide whether they want to or not but certainly until they are 12 I feel parents have a right to insist they take piano lessons even if they hate it... I say do it for me or I say go to these clinics because you'll learn to skate and have more fun in the winter time instead of sitting on the sidelines... so we're trying to make them try different things.

It's all in fun, it's in good sportsmanship... it's not 'you've got to go in there and win'... because I don't care if my children are good in sports as long as they're in there trying and having fun at it.

Sometimes I think to myself 'poor T. why am I doing this to him', because out at that clinic I know he was just looking at the clock wishing... 'only fifteen more minutes and I can go home'... but once he knows how to do it then... when it's easy it's fun... and while you can't do it, it's hard.

- Q. Do you have any expectations as to the level he may attain?
- A. I think that when you're good in something you enjoy it more. If you're a lousy skater you don't want to go out and skate. If you do it reasonably well... then you enjoy it. I'd like my children to be able to do most things reasonably well, not better than everyone else, but well enough so they could enjoy it.

Any time a series of lessons comes up that will help them gain another step up... 'till the age where they said 'look Mom, I've had it, I don't want to ski or take these lessons or go swimming anymore'... then fine, we may let them go... say 'you don't have to'... but now when they're in these formative years... I think that if anything comes along that's going to help them... we'll just put them one level higher and make them go.

We are almost forcing them to take part in anything that is available and convenient by enrolling them and making them go.

- Q. You'll enroll them and then if they don't like it then they don't have to go the next year?
- A. No because I don't think one year is a fair enough assumption... as I said they're only 8 and 9 and 10 years old... they've got to keep trying... keep on with the skiing... keep on with the swimming and the hockey. So I think we'll just keep encouraging the kids to go back and will enroll them.

Q. Is there anything you don't like about sports?

A. No... I can see that there have been a lot of complaints about little league sports in that it's not for the children but for the parents... but I don't think I believe that because I think it's a lot of propaganda. Nothing really bothers me about sports.

Case 4 (NP 32):

Q. What do you dislike about sports?

A. Kids playing hockey almost terrifies me... if there's a thing they can be hurt in I'm squeamish. If my boys had mentioned they wanted to go and play hockey... they could have... but I'm just as happy they don't want to... with the accidents you see... like teeth missing... the odd child being killed.

Case 5 (NP 22):

Q. Have you encouraged your kids to get involved in sports?

A. My older boy wanted to join baseball in the community league one year but we found that they practiced and had games on Sunday which my husband is very much against and so we have kinda discouraged them against doing things too much... getting too involved in things that they have to do on Sunday... because we feel that they should be in church... what they can do during the week... that's fine but we don't want them doing it on Sundays. In a way we've discouraged them from doing things with the community or with the city because of that.

APPENDIX G
REPORT SENT TO COMMUNITY

My most sincere appreciation is extended to all of you for your cooperation in this study. I learned a great deal as a result of the study and now hope to contribute something back to the community. A brief summary of some of the relevant findings is enclosed as was promised at the outset. For those who are interested, a much more detailed account of the study, in the form of a thesis entitled "A Socio-Psychological Analysis of Early Sports Participation," can be found in room E-477 of the new Physical Education Building at the University of Alberta.

I am greatly indebted to you for your assistance.

Very sincerely yours,

Terry Orlick

REPORT ON THE CHILDREN'S SPORTS STUDY CONDUCTED IN THE BROOKSIDE-RIVERBEND COMMUNITY

Introduction

The central purpose of this study was to explore the question of why some children participated in an organized, competitive sport program and others did not. Specifically the investigation dealt with a group of 32 eight- and nine-year-old boys, all of whom had easy access to the available sports programs in their community. The children were similar with respect to the major variables sometimes thought to affect the results of this type of study (i.e., age, sex, height, weight, grade, socio-economic level, parents educational levels, school attended, availability of programs, facilities, and information, etc.). The boys were divided into two groups: 16 participants and 16 non-participants. A participant was defined as any boy taking part in the competitive hockey program offered through the community, and a non-participant was any boy not taking part in any of the available competitive sport programs.

Family Sports Environment

The most significant and consistent differences found between participant and non-participant children in this study was with reference to the family sports environments

from which they emerged. It would appear that parents have a very significant influence on their children (at this age) in terms of whether or not they participate in organized sports. If the child emerges from a positive family sports environment where (1) the parents (one or both) participate in sports themselves, (2) the parents attend games and watch sports, (3) the parents have definite expectations and aspirations regarding the child's participation, and (4) the parents encourage the child to participate, the probability of the child participating is extremely high. Conversely, if the child comes from a negative or low positive family sports environment where none or few of these life forces are operating, the probability of the child participating is very low.

Child Sports Environment

Expectancy of positive or negative consequences appears to play a critical role in determining whether or not a child elects to participate in sports. Children who elected to participate in sports expected that going out for a team would be a positive experience, while children who did not elect to participate tended to expect it to be a negative experience. Negative expectancies were evidenced by expressions such as: not being able to make the team, not being any good, being scared, getting in the way, and not liking it. Positive expectancies were evidenced by expressions such as: being able to make the team easily, being

good, and having lots of fun. Participant children expected to make the team and to be good at sports. They also felt that their parents expected them to participate in sports, and expected to please their parents by participating.

Active and Quiet Interests

With reference to active interests, 93.8 percent (or more) of the participant children indicated that they would like to: go swimming, shoot targets with a bow and arrow or b-b gun, play hockey, play football, and go camping. Of the non-participant children, 87.5 percent (or more) indicated that they would like to: climb trees, go camping, explore caves, go sledding in the snow, and shoot targets with a bow and arrow or b-b gun. The top five choices of the non-participant children can be thought of in terms of individual, non-competitive activities, whereas at least two (possibly more) of the participants' top choices have a team and/or competitive orientation. Non-participant children also had a greater number of quiet interests than did participant children, most of which tended to be individualistic and non-competitive.

Activities in which a large percentage of both participants and non-participants expressed an interest included: camping (93.8%), shooting targets with a bow and arrow or b-b gun (93.8%), swimming (90.6%), exploring caves (87.5%), and riding horseback (81.3%).

The top four items that both participants' and non-participants' parents would like to have available in the community included: a swimming pool, tennis courts, an indoor arena and more activities for girls.

Revisions Needed in Children's Sports

This study indicates that the present sports system is in need of revision in order to provide personnel and activities that meet the needs and interests of different types of children from different types of backgrounds. The reward structure which now exists in organized sports does not appear to be consistent with what is in the best interest of the majority of the children. There appears to be an over-emphasis on winning at the expense of fun involvement. This gives rise to an elitest atmosphere wherein many youngsters eliminate themselves before they start while others begin to withdraw at seven- and eight-years of age. In many cases organized sports appeared to operate as extremely efficient screening process for the elimination of children.

Over 80 percent of all the mothers in this study expressed a dislike for the winning emphasis, the pressure, or the competitiveness in children's sports. They indicated that they would prefer to see these things de-emphasized and the emphasis put on fun and enjoyment, along with giving each child an equal opportunity to play. Children were very aware of the fact that they had to be good to either make the team

or to play regularly. Seventy-five percent of the non-participant children, all of whom thought they were not good enough to make the team, indicated that they would go out for a team if they thought they would surely make it.

Children who dropped out of sports at an early age appeared to be merely reacting to negative stimuli, which were largely a function of the structure of the game and the emphasis of the coaches. For example, three drop-out children (two eight-year-olds and one nine-year-old) when asked how good they would like to be at sports responded as follows:

"Perfect . . . so when I wanted to play, I could play."

"Good enough so I could play sports and I wouldn't get fired on anything I went on."

"Really good . . . because if you're not the coach won't think very much about you."

The majority of the drop-out children indicated that they dropped out because: "they never let me play." A system which makes "being good" a prerequisite to playing would not appear to foster mass participation.

Many children (both participants and non-participants) indicated that they would like sports to be scaled down to their level. Some general suggestions made by the children towards this end included: making the games easier, cutting down the length of the games but increasing the actual playing time (as opposed to sitting), making the playing areas smaller, playing more and practicing less, cutting down on boring repetition (e.g., drills), cutting down on the roughness

and promoting honesty and truthfulness in obeying rules.

The children also had some specific suggestions for improving several sports. Those pertaining to baseball and hockey are discussed below. Many children felt that baseball should be changed so they could hit the ball more often (at bat) and get the ball more often in the field. Some specific suggestions for accomplishing this included making the field smaller, the bases shorter, the bats bigger, allowing more swings at the ball and more outs to retire a side. In hockey, children indicated that they did not like being pushed around, checked, boarded, and getting cold. They would like to do more playing and less sitting around "freezing." They would also like to get the puck more often and to be able to skate better.

By implementing some of the children's suggestions, it would appear that many positive adjustments could be made in children's sports. For example, by scaling down the games, children will have a greater chance of attaining some success and will conceivably have a more enjoyable experience.

In attempting to provide for all types of children, it should be remembered that many children in this study were not interested in activities of a highly competitive or team nature (i.e., child versus child or team versus team). More individual and/or non-competitive activities should be provided to meet the needs of these children and facilities should also be made available for children to "just play"

without any adult intervention. It should not be a case of "super-organized or unavailable," as one mother expressed it.

If one is to seriously think about maximizing participation in sports and physical recreation, it seems imperative that all children receive positive, fun-filled exposures to activity. Certain types of children may have to be repeatedly assured that there is a place for them as a participant in sport where they can have fun and experience success without being humiliated. People are vitally needed in the elementary schools and in the community leagues who are sensitive to the needs of the children and who are intent upon operating in the child's best interest. The findings of this study indicate that coaches who are working with young children should be focusing their attention on giving each child a positive experience, with the pursuit of winning kept in its proper perspective (as a secondary consideration at best). The importance of a child having an early positive exposure to physical activity cannot be overemphasized. What happens at an early age level can have a significant impact upon the child's expectations and behavior for years to come.

T. D. Orlick
University of Alberta

B30042